

A
RÉVIEW
A. N. D. U. 7. 152
EXAMINATION
OF
A BOOK, bearing the Title of the
HISTORY
OF THE
Indulgence.

Wherein the lawfulness of the acceptance
of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, granted
by the Acts of the Magistrates Indulgent, is de-
monstrated, contrary Objections answered, and
the Vindication of such as withdraw from hear-
ing Indulged Ministers, is confuted.

To which is added, a Survey of the mis-
chievous absurdities of the late Bond, and
Sanquhair Declaration.

Rom. 14. 19. *Let us therefore follow after the things which
make for peace, and things wherewith one may edifie another.*
Prov. 24. 21. *My son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and
meddle not with them that are given to change, &c.*

LONDON: Printed for Tho. Cockerill, at the Three Legs
in the Poultry, over-against the Stocks Market. 1681.

07.96

A Review and Examination
of a Book; bearing the Ti-
tle of the *History of the In-
dulgence, &c.*

AMongst the many sad tokens, and prodigious Prognosticks of Gods anger against the Church of *Scotland*, our multiplied Divisions are none of the least. The righteous and holy God being deeply provoked, hath armed every man against his brother, so that *Manasseh* is against *Ephraim*, and *Ephraim* against *Manasseh*, and they both together against *Judah*. And the Lord hath hereby, in the open view of the Atheistical and prophane world, poured contempt upon the remnant of his people, that desire to cleave to his way and truth, and made them despicable, as a broken vessel that cannot be made whole again. And this is the more afflicting, that these contentions abound in a time, wherein the Protestant Religion is visibly in so great danger from Popery and Popish Plots. It therefore concerns all them, who are any thing affected with the

wrath and anger of a jealous and provoked God, to lye in the dust, to search out their own sins and provocations, and sincerely bewail them before the Lord. And although the publick defections and provocations, ought not to be slighted, but much sorrowed for; yet it is to be feared, that personal humiliation, repentance, and reformation, hath been little minded by many pretending to the abhorrence of publick sins. O that every one of us might find grace, seriously to enquire what we have done, and that (at such a time, when all souls serious exercise of Religion is like to evanish into notions and debates) every one of us would lay to heart the evil of his way, both as to accession unto publick provocations, and as to personal sins. It is now high time, when the Lord is so visibly taking vengeance for our inventions.

It hath been the sad observation of divers, that every new tryal hath been the occasion of a new difference, if not division. The Lord partly, in his holy displeasure, withdrawing light, and chastising his people for their sins, and partly trying, and exercising of them in that great duty of mutual forbearance, so little made conscience of; and partly discovering infirmities, much drops in his own, by the contests so carnally managed. This we are now to instance in the Indulgence, which although it was first looked on as a favour and mercy from God, and the Ministers that imbraced it were advised thereto by the generality of outed Ministers (a great part whereof were then at *Edenborough*); yet now the contention about it is come to such a height, that the acceptance is cried
 *
 down,

down, as highly sinful, and the hearing of Indulged Ministers Preached and written against, as utterly unlawful: The Indulged Ministers have generally hitherto (for ought I know), with much Christian meekness and patience, endured reproach, finding that what Letters were spread abroad against them, did contain nothing but high Magisterial dictates, without any shew of arguments; as also, they were resolved by their silence and forbearance, to evidence their great desire to prevent contentions: but now, lest their silence should be looked on as faintness, arising from the conviction of the evil of their Cause (which, it seems, made the Author of one of these Letters to write, that they never had the heart to dare to speak for themselves), I shall say something in their behalf. I must confess, I am astonished to read these Papers that are going up and down amongst the people, wherein with high and bitter words (which I love not to repeat), the Indulged Ministers are represented, as having acknowledged, and homologate a formal Ecclesiastick Supremacy, assumed by the Magistrate, and having subjected their Ministry in a direct line of subordination unto his cognizance (as inferiour Civil Courts are unto the superiour); yea not only so, but these grave and worthy Ministers, who thought it their duty to notice, and bring to an account some few Probationers, that were visibly sowing sedition, and kindling a flame, are represented as enamoured with that Idol of Jealousie (meaning the Indulgence), and as acted by the spirit of Antichrist. And where-

fore? Because they took upon them to question the carriage of a few hardy and extravagant young men, the tendency of whose way, will ere long make it to appear, what a spirit they were acted by. But before I go further, I must here protest, that the personal reproaches cast upon those honest Ministers, are not so much the motive that prevails with me to put Pen to Paper, upon this Subject, as respect unto the Truth, and publick Interest of the Church (the unity and order whereof seems to be wholly shaken, and going to ruine, by the courses driven on by some), and to the Gospel of Jesus Christ Preached by them, who, I am sure, have been armed by God in the Ministry, with a blessing upon the souls of many; though it is like these that now seek to decry the Indulged Ministers, will not believe that ever their Ministry was blessed and countenanced of God; and how can they, seeing they look not upon them as the Ambassadors of Christ? But blessed be God, who hath looked upon them as his Ambassadors, and hath not left their Ministry without the seal of a sensible blessing upon many.

But that I may inform honest well-meaning people, who are jumbled and confounded with questions about the acceptance of the Indulgence, and about hearing of Indulged Ministers, I shall endeavour to lay the matter open in a plain conference; The persons conferring, shall be a *Minister* not Indulged, but clear for hearing Indulged Ministers: an ingenious *Farmer*, who scruples to hear Indulged Ministers, and a *Preacher*, who

who is against the hearing of Indulged Ministers.

Farmer. Sir, it is now near Sun-setting, I would be much obliged to you, if you would be pleased to lodg at my house this night.

Minister. I would be nearer the Church, ere I take up my lodging; for I use to make my Sabbath-days journeys as short as I can.

Farm. You will be nighted ere you can come where you can have any tollerable lodging, and you may with ease reach the Church to morrow before Sermon-time.

Min. Well, I am content to stay with you.

Farm. I assure you of welcom. When you have taken some refreshment, I shall within a little advertise you when to come to the Family-exercise; and after Supper I shall desire half an hours conference about a particular, with which I will not now trouble you.

Min. I use to be heavy after Supper, I had rather take a little time just now, or, if the matter be fit for a Sabbath-days discourse, we may confer upon it to morrow in our way to the Church.

Farm. It is almost all the matter of some folks discourse upon the Sabbath; but for my self, though I am sometimes a hearer of such discourses upon the Sabbath, I have no great pleasure in them, for I find not my self edified by them, as I was wont to be with the discourses which we used long since to have upon the Lords day. As for going to the Church with you to morrow, I desire you would excuse me in that matter, for I

have not clearness to hear Indulged Ministers; but you shall not want company, for there are several of my Family, who have clearness to hear, and I dare not hinder them.

Min. I commend you, in that you do not impose your opinion in that matter upon others: but did you not once hear Indulged Ministers?

Farm. I did; but I have more light about the Indulgence than I had; and I am much confirmed in withdrawing from hearing, by a *Preacher* who is in the next Chamber; and, if you will, I shall call him to the conference about the Indulgence; for this is the conference which I designed to trouble you with after Supper.

Min. I think it very fit that you call him.

Preacher. I have over-heard you, and half an invitation is enough to ingage me in that conference which ye design; but I desire, Sir, that you and our Landlord may enter upon it, and I shall speak when I think it convenient.

Min. Seeing you did once hear the Indulged Minister, who is settled in this Parish, why did you withdraw from hearing him?

Farm. It is very confidently said, by those who are acknowledged for able men, and very zealous, that the Indulged are not the Ministers of Christ, but of men.

Min. It is as confidently said, by as able and zealous men, That the Indulged Ministers are the Ministers of Christ, and not the Ministers of men. But our faith and practice must not be ruled by mens sayings, how confident soever the sayers be: Ye know the Reformed Churches have, with de-
testation,

testation, rejected that error of the Popish Doctors, that people should implicitly, that is, in effect blindly believe all that they say, and do all that they direct.

Farm. But do you think, Sir, that so able and zealous Preachers would deceive us poor people ?

Min. I do not say, that they would deceive you ; but seeing able and zealous, yea, and godly men may themselves be deceived (for the best of men are fallible, and may err in many things, so long as they have corruption remaining in them, and know but in part), they may deceive others in those things in which they are themselves deceived, though they do not design to deceive either themselves or others. But I wonder how any can have the confidence to say, that they are not the Ministers of Christ : were they not ordained Ministers by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery ?

Farm. I acknowledg that they were ordained in the way appointed by Christ to feed the flock of God.

Min. Do they not Preach the wholesome words of Christ, and not the inventions and Doctrines of men ?

Farm. I cannot deny that, for they Preach the Doctrine contained in the Scriptures, which was taught to us in our best times ; I hear of no change in their Doctrine.

Pr. Sir, we do not question their Ordination, they had their Potestative Mission from Christ by the Presbytery ; and if we should deny them

to be lawfully called, and sent to Preach the Gospel, we should condemn the Ordination, and calling of all Presbyterian Ministers ; nor do we deny that they Preach the Gospel, and administer Gospel Ordinances according to Christs institution ; nor do we charge them with Preaching the Doctrines of men.

Min. Seeing ye grant that they are sent of God, and that they speak the words of God, and not the Precepts and Doctrines of men, why deny you them to be the Ministers of Christ, and alledge that they are the Ministers of men ?

Pr. They have renounced their former Mission, which they had from Christ, and have now their Potestative Mission from the Magistrate, and have subjected their Ministry in a direct line of Subordination to the Magistrates cognizance, as inferior Civil Courts are unto the superiour ; and they have received their instructions, for regulating them in the exercise of their Ministry, from the Magistrate.

Min. I have seen these things, which you say, Written and Printed, but they are so manifestly false, that I wonder how any could write them, and I am sorry to hear you repeat them as if they were true ; for the Magistrate did not so much as pretend to ordain them, or to make them Ministers ; for the Act of Indulgence supposes them to be Ministers, and only permits them, or puts them to the exercise of the Ministry. Those Ministers were so far from renouncing their dependance on Christ, and their Mission from him, that they at the first acceptance of the Indulgence, declared

to the Council, that they were the Ministers of Christ, that they had received their Ministry from Christ; and they were so far from subjecting their Ministry, and the matters of their Ministry, to the Magistrates pleasure, that they declared, that they were the servants of Christ in these matters, and that they would behave, as became the faithful Ministers of Christ; and they were so far from receiving the Magistrates instructions, that they declared they could not receive from the Magistrate instructions intrinsically Ecclesiastical, to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry; and the Author of the History of the Indulgence grants, that Mr. *Blair* did give a faithful testimony against these instructions, and that Mr. *Hutcheson* said the same upon the matter with Mr. *Blair*; and as these Ministers did by word, in the presence of the Council, shew that they could not accept of such instructions of their Lordships making, and imposing, and did design them impositions; so their practice did evidence, that they did not accept of these instructions; and any who will but read Mr. *H*'s speech at the first Indulgence, in which he asserts, That as they had received their Ministry from Christ, and full prescriptions to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry, so they were to discharge it, as they would be accountable to Christ; will wonder how any person, let be a Minister, who had read that speech, could harbour any such ugly injurious thoughts of these Ministers, and much more that any could deliberately write and Print such horrid falsehoods and reproaches of honest Ministers.

Farm. If

Farm. If these things be so as you have represented them, it seems, that the Indulged Ministers are wronged.

Min. If you doubt of the truth of what I have said, I desire you may read the *History of the Indulgence*, and you shall find these things which I have said here, recorded there.

Pr. That cannot be denied, but that Historian says, that upon the matter the Indulged Ministers renounced, &c.

Min. That addition of the words upon the matter, is but a meer blind, it may beguile simple people, but no judicious person will be deceived by it, seeing there is nothing either in the matter or form of what these Ministers said, or did, which doth import any such thing, as that Historian alledges; and although these Ministers had said nothing of their receiving their Ministry from Christ, &c. before the Council, it had been a very uncharitable construction to have construed their silence to be a renunciation of their dependence on Christ, &c. but it's a horrid injury to charge them [with the renunciation of that which they expressly own before the Magistrate.

Pr. But Sir, have not they their Ministry, and the exercise of their Ministry in these Parishes, from the Magistrate?

Min. They have their Ministerial calling, or which is all one, Authority, to exercise the acts of their Ministerial Office, from Jesus Christ, as the fountain of their spiritual power; and this Ministerial Authority flowing from God, was conveyed to them by the Presbyteries, by which they

they were ordained Ministers according to Christ institution. But they have the peaceable publick exercise of their Ministry, in these places, by the Magistrate, under God. It's the Magistrates civil Authority, by which the penal Statutes, which rendered their Preaching hazardous, are removed, or relaxed; by the protection of Civil Authority, they have the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, or they have freedom from molestation or disturbance, while they are exercising their Ministry in these places. Before the Act of Indulgence they had their Ministerial Authority, and did Preach upon hazard before they were Indulged; but by the Indulgence they had this benefit, that whereas before it, they were exposed to hazard wherever they Preached, whether in private or publick; after it, they might Preach publicly, and exercise the other parts of the Ministerial Office, in some places, without molestation.

Pr. Their accepting of the Indulgence, and the peoples hearing of them who have accepted the Indulgence, is an Homologation of the Supremacy.

Farm. Sir, I beseech you make use of some other word than that long word, with the four O's in it; for though I have often heard it, I ingeniously profess I do not understand it. I always thought, that many of our Country people rendered themselves ridiculous, by learning to speak words, like Parrots, which they did not understand.

Min. That's not the worst of it; for when poor people are once brought to speak confidently they

they wot not what; they may be brought next to do they know not what; and to stumble they know not at what: As it was indiscreetly done to bring in this long Greek word among unlearned people, so this word is miserably misapplied in the business of the Indulgence; for to homologate, is to say what was before said, in the same or like words; as when in a Court one declares his mind in some matter, and another rises up after him, and says the same which he said, in the same, or like words; this last speaker is said to homologate what the other said before him. Now the Indulged Ministers, when they accepted the Indulgence, were far from saying that the Magistrate had a Spiritual Supremacy, or an absolute Supremacy; they never said it, they never thought it; they declare, that the Magistrate hath not the power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven at all, and much less a Supremacy of Spiritual power; and they declare, that the Magistrate may not do what he pleases in Ecclesiastical matters; for all things in the Church of God must be done according to the will of the God of Heaven, and not according to the will of man; they were so far from saying any thing for the Magistrates Spiritual or absolute Supremacy, or any thing that sounded that way, that they said much to the contrary, as appears in their speeches before the Council; and as they said nothing sounding this way, so they did nothing in accepting the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, which did any way import any approbation of any unlawful Supremacy; they grant, that the King is Supreme Civil Govern-
ment

hour of his Kingdoms; and that it belongs to the Magistrate, as Magistrate, to take off civil restraints, which hinder Ministers from the peaceable exercise of their Ministry; and that the Magistrate should permit and allow Ministers to exercise their Ministerial Office in his Dominions; and when the Magistrate did this in the Indulgence, he did not exercise any unlawful Supremacy, but did exercise that lawful Authority which he hath from God, for good; and when they made use of the liberty granted by the exercise of lawful Authority, they did not approve of any sinful Supremacy, but did approve, and make use of that lawful power which the Magistrate hath from God. All Orthodox Divines grant, that the Magistrate not only may, but should permit, allow, countenance, and protect the exercise of the Ministry of the Gospel in his Dominions; and when there is need, the Magistrate may command and compel Ministers to do the work of their Office, as appears from the Books of Discipline of the Church of *Scotland*.

Farm. Sir, I am feared to sin; and we are told, that there is sin wrapt up in hearing Indulged Ministers.

Min. We should be feared for sin, and for that sin, among the rest, of adding to the word of God; they who make these actions, which are not transgressions of the Law, to be sins, do highly provoke God; but they who make these actions which God not only permits, but also commands and commends, to be sins, they set themselves in the Throne of God, and annul his Law,
and

and countermand the commands of the most high God: Sin, ye know, is the transgression of the Law of God; before ye believe that the hearing Ministers of the Gospel Preach the Gospel, is sin, ye should require, that they who say so much, shew you what command of God is transgressed by your hearing Indulged Ministers; for if ye be so easily driven from the worship of God by strong alledgments, the Devil can alledg as strongly, and suggest it importunately, that it is a sin to pray in your Family, in which it may be there are some profane persons; and if ye be driven from Family-worship by such alledgances, he will alledg, that it is a sin for you to believe on the Name of the Lord Jesus; and thus drill you from all exercises of Religion, publick, private, and secret.

Farm. But Sir, seeing I doubt if it be lawful to hear, I would be damned if I did hear; for ye know the Apostle says, *he that doubteth is damned, if he eat.*

Min. But if you take up doubtings, whether ye should do what God hath commanded, and that upon meer alledgances that these duties are sin, you lay your self open to the tentations of Satan, who by this method will drive you from all duty, and by your doubtings make void the law of God; for he will strongly alledg, that it's a sin to pray to God; and if ye upon this doubt, if ye should pray, and then upon your doubting forbear praying, what comes of the command, That men must always pray, and not faint? There is a great difference betwixt praying, hearing the word of God, and the eating of meats, which
the

the Apostle speaks of in that fourteenth Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, for it was once unlawful to eat of those meats which was discharged in the Ceremonial Law, and it was not necessary by any precept to eat of those meats; so that the weak Christian who did not yet understand that the Ceremonial Law was abrogate, was under no obligation to eat of those meats; it was lawful to those who knew their Christian liberty to eat (providing they did not use their liberty unseasonably before weak ones, and so induce them to do what they judged unlawful) and it was lawful to them to forbear; the use of these things being at that time, as Mr. *Rutherford* shews in his *Treatise of Scandal*, every way indifferent.

The doubting of these weak ones, did arise from the Ceremonial Law, which was unquestionably the Law of God; and there was no Law obliging them to eat of these meats at that time; and so their doubting in such a case at that time, was a doubt very incident to those who did know the Law, and were tender of it; and their knowledge that that Ceremonial Law was the Law of God, and their fear to break the Law of God, occasioned their doubting; and there was no hazard of sin in forbearing to eat, but there was sin in eating, so long as their doubt remained; and therefore the Lord would not have the strong eating before these weak ones, to wound their weak Consciences.

Hence it appears, that they who would from this place plead for their forbearing to pray or to hear the word of God, because, forsooth, they doubt

doubt if they should pray or hear Gods word ; they fearfully misapply and wrest that Scripture ; for this doubt is no ways like the Jews doubt, about eating of such or such meats ; for the Lord had once forbidden to eat of these meats, but he never forbad the hearing of his own Word, he never forbad prayer.

2. There was no command obliging these weak *Jews* to eat of these forbidden meats at that time ; but there is a command obliging us to hear the Word of God, and not to forsake the assembling of our selves together, not to despise prophecyng, and obliging us to pray without ceasing.

3. These doubtings of the weak *Jews* was not damnable ; for they did not incur the hazard of damnation by their doubting, but by their eating with a doubting Conscience. But the doubting of these, who doubt if they should hear the Word of God, and if they should joyn with the Church of God in hearing the Word of God, in praying and praising, their doubting is damnable, and they should repel it with detestation and abhorrency, and not so much as listen to such a suggestion of the Devil, who goes about to make void the Law of God, by raising such prophane and godless doubtings in mens minds, that he may drive them from all Religious exercises, to gross profanity : And if people would observe what absurdities this doubting to hear Indulged Ministers, has produced, it might, through the blessing of God, be a means to clear them of these doubtings. I doubt not, but
ye

ye have heard of some, who from doubting to hear Indulged Ministers, have proceeded to doubt if they should hear any Ministers who were for hearing Indulged Ministers; and some have gone that length, that they would hear none but those who were not only against hearing Indulged Ministers, but also Preached against the hearing of them; and some have doubted themselves out of all hearing; and some are come to that, that they will not joyn in private prayer with those who hear Indulged Ministers. It's true wisdom and tenderness to repel doubts and scruples, which hinder us from the worship of God, or move us in it, that they may not get any entrance into our minds and consciences; and if they have entered, we should cast them out with detestation.

Farm. But though that was granted, that there were no sin in hearing them; yet seeing they are not the Ministers of those Congregations where they are settled, there is no obligation upon these people to hear them, seeing they are not their Ministers.

Mm. Some of them are in the Parishes where they were ordained Ministers by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Others of them, who had no access to the Congregations where they were ordained, were cordially invited by vacant destitute Congregations; and the Ministers concerned, approved of the peoples invitation, and of the Ministers going to these Parishes upon the peoples invitation. And what more could be expected in a broken time, when Pres-

byterial Government was broken, and General Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, dissolved, and Presbyterian Ministers turned out of their Churches, and dispersed and scattered through the Nation? If these Congregations cast at these Indulged Ministers, and disown them as not their Ministers, and so think themselves loosed of all obligation to hear them, they shake themselves loose of any obligation to hear any Ministers; for no other Ministers can pretend such interest in these Congregations as they really have, upon the grounds which I mentioned. If you be not obliged to hear the Indulged Minister, who is in your Parish, because he is not your Minister, then upon the same ground ye are not obliged to hear any outed Ministers, who occasionally come alongs to Preach; for they are not Ministers of this Congregation: And if ye be obliged to hear them, though they be not Ministers of this Congregation, why are ye not also obliged to hear the Indulged Ministers, though they were not Ministers of these Congregations? They who shake themselves loose of any relation to the Indulged Ministers, will very easily shake themselves loose of any obligation to hear others. And this is the thing which the Devil designs, to cast the people loose of all relation to Ministers, and of all obligation to hear any, whether Indulged, or no Indulged. And he hath gained this design, as to some, who are come to that, that they think not themselves obliged to hear any, except it be one or two whom they think the only witnesses; and others think themselves obliged

liged not to hear these, and think it much better to hear none, than to hear these, who teach such strange, and wild conceits, which tend to the confusion both of the Church and Kingdom; and many finding, that all obligation to hear any Ministers, is called in question, and that the hearing of Ministers depends upon their own pleasure, they are better pleased to stay at home on the Sabbath, than to go any where, to hear any Minister; and this is like to prevail with people who have not any true principle of Religion; for this is an easie way, and pleasing to flesh and blood.

Farm. The Indulged Ministers, do not bring forward the whole Reformation with them; they have no Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies; they have quit these: Our godly Ancestors would have taken nothing, except they had gotten all, they would not have quit with a hoof; and seeing it is so, how should we own them, or hear them, who are so far degenerate from the zeal of the Ministers of Christ who lived in former times?

Min. This reason, if it were good, would cast all the Ministers who are not Indulged, as well as the Indulged; for they want Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies; in the fields, or houses where they Preach, they do not bring the whole frame of Presbyterian Government along with them where they come to Preach; and if you do not disown them, because they want general Assemblies, &c. why should you disown Indulged Ministers upon this account? Will you

add affliction to the afflicted ? And because the Lord in his righteous Judgments hath taken away these solemn Courts of his House, which were great blessings to the Church, and hath scattered his Servants; will ye as far as in you lies, deprive them of the power of Preaching the Gospel, because they have not access to the exercise of Government? This looks like a judicial infatuation, to cast at any remnant of Gods Ordinances, because ye have not all; doth this look like humility? or looks this like the frame of the Godly Israelites, who when the stately Temple was ruined, yet took pleasure in the Stones of *Zion*, and favoured the Dust thereof?

2. General Assemblies, Synods, Presbyteries, were taken away long before the Indulgence; and therefore 'tis a foolish Calumny which hath no shadow of likelihood, that the Indulged Ministers by accepting the Indulgence, did quit these Courts; for they were quit and gone before the Indulgence; the Indulged Ministers got somewhat of that which they formerly had, liberty to Preach without hazard in some places, and to keep Church-Sessions; but they quit nothing when they accepted of that.

3. 'Tis a great wrong done to our Ancestors, to alledge that they were such humorous Fools, that they would take nothing from the Magistrate if he withheld any thing which was due to the Church: They did indeed desire all the Churches priviledges, but they took what they could get, and made the best use of it in the mean time, till more came.

Although

Although Queen *Mary* laboured to impose Popery upon the Nation, and was far from granting all which She should have granted; yet as they, who were of the Reformed Religion, were far from scrupling to seek and petition for liberty to their Ministers to Preach the Gospel; so when these Petitions, or any part thereof, was granted, they thankfully accepted of what was granted. And although King *James* and his Heirs and Successors have a vast Supremacy settled upon them, *Anno 1584. Parl. 8. James 6.* And though he exerted that Supremacy; yet the Ministers, though they found themselves deprived of their priviledges, which they judged due to the Church, and though several of them were imprisoned, banished for their adhering to these priviledges; yet they were always willing to take the liberty of Preaching the Gospel when the King granted it; and when they could not get access to their own Charges, they did take other Charges. Mr. *Bruce* did not return to *Edenburgh*, his proper Charge, but to *Larber*: When Mr. *Scrimgeour*, Minister of *Kinghorn*, was outed, he was so glad when he heard that an honest Minister would be permitted to go to his Charge, that he said, O to have it but one day old, I would with joy bear him on my back, to have the Gospel preached to my poor people. Mr. *Welch*, a man of God, when he was imprisoned in the Castle of *Edenburgh* for holding the Assembly at *Aberdeen*, he was so far from refusing to take liberty to Preach from the King, till he repented and restored the Churches priviledges, and till the Church got all that was

due; that he desires the Lord *Ochletree* to carry a Petition from him to his Majesty, intreating for liberty to Preach the Gospel: And thus he owned a lawful Civil Supremacy in the King, and sued for its lawful exercise, in granting the liberty to Preach the Gospel, even when he was suffering upon the account of his disowning the Kings spiritual or vast Supremacy. Dr. *Sharp*, after his banishment returns not to his own Charge, but to *Edenburgh*, when permitted.

In the Reign of King *Charles* the First, they begin with a Petition to be free of Innovations, afterward they Petition for an Assembly, they were not of that opinion, that they would seek or take nothing from the King, except he would right all that was wrong in the Government and Worship at the first.

The famous Assembly of Divines which met at *Westminster*, and composed the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Directory for Worship, &c. when called together by the Parliament in the year 1643. they were not only all nominated by the Parliament, but the Prolocutor was named and chosen to them by Ordinance of Parliament; also they were limited so as to meddle only with the exercise of dogmatick power, and that only in such matters, as should from time to time be proposed to them by the Parliament; and in case of difference among themselves, they were to receive directions from the Houses of Parliament; and beside many other things, that Ordinance of the Lords and Commons, provides in the close, that they in that Assembly shall not assume to exercise

ercise any Jurisdiction, Power, or Authority Ecclesiastical whatsoever, or any other power than is herein particularly expressed. Yet these Divines did not refuse to sit, because of the limitations and restraints, although divers of these cannot but be looked on as incroaching too much upon that Assemblies liberty: As also the General Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, did approve of the said Assembly, sent their Commissioners to it, who took the Oath of the Assembly, and their sitting in that Assembly was approved, as the Printed Acts of our Assembly do fully bear.

I shall here insert a Paper intituled,

Certain

Certain Considerations, and Cautions, agreed upon by the Ministers of *London and Westminster*, and within the Lines of Communication, *June 19. 1646.* According to which they resolved to put the Presbyterian Government in Execution, upon the Ordinance of Parliament heretofore published by Authority. Printed by T. R. and E. N.

WE Ministers of Christ, resident within the Cities of London and Westminster, and Lines of Communication, having seen and read an Order of the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament, bearing date, June 9. 1646. requiring, and enjoying all the Ministers of the Province of London, forthwith to put in Execution the Ordinances concerning Church-Government, we thought it requisite humbly and faithfully, as in the sight of God, to shew our judgments and resolutions about this weighty matter, for clearing of our integrity,

grity, and preserving our Consciences void of offence both towards God and man.

We have secondly, pondered the state of things, and find our selves, whether we act as is required, or act not, in a very great strait: On the one side, Prelacy being justly pulled down, and the Church miserably groaning under discord and confusion, many things cry aloud upon us, in our places, to put Church-Government into actual Execution; the Glory of God, the edification of his Church, the duty of our Functions, the engagement of our solemn Covenant with God, the command of the Civil Magistrate, which so far as we can with a good Conscience, we are resolved, and hold it our duty to obey, and the present unspeakable miseries of the Church, by woful Divisions, Blasphemies, Heresies, abominable Laziness, Libertinism, Atheism, the spiritual ruines of many Congregations through false Teachers, for want of faithful Pastors, for lack of Ordination. On the other hand, upon consideration of all the Ordinances of Parliament about Church-Government, we find many necessary things, not yet established, and some things wherein our Consciences are not fully satisfied; and therefore in our beginning to act, we cannot but see how sinisterly we are like to be interpreted by many, who are prone to misconstrue all our actions of this nature.

We hereupon hold it necessary, to express upon what grounds we may proceed to act upon the Ordinances already established by Authority, although that we conceive the power of Church-Censures, and particularly the Lords Supper, to be in the Church Officers, by the will and appointment of Jesus Christ, and
from

from him they receive their Office and Authority; yet we acknowledg, it belongs to the Magistrate to have his Conscience satisfied in the truth of the Government of the Church which he will set up by his Authority, from whom the Church-Officers do receive Authority of the publick exercise of their Offices, in his Dominions; and in case the Magistrate be not fully informed, as to set up a right and perfect rule in every particular, the Church-Officers may act under that rule, provided they do not subscribe to, nor otherwise acknowledg that rule to be intire, and right in all points; and therefore for these particular Ordinances, although we humbly conceive they do not hold forth a compleat rule, nor are in all points satisfactory to our Consciences, yet because we find many things established in them, agreable to the word of God, for which we desire heartily to bless God, and to be thankful to the Honourable House, provision being made for enabling of the Elderships, by their Authority to keep away from the Lords Supper all ignorant persons, and many scandalous persons, with a Declaration of their resolution, that all notorious and scandalous persons shall be kepted from the Sacrament, and that there shall be an addition to the scandalous offences formerly enumerated. We conceive it is our duty to begin to act, in reference to Church-Government, by Congregational, Classial, Provincial, and National Assemblies; resolving by the grace of God, to walk in all things according to the Word, and according to the Ordinances, so far as we conceive them correspondent to it, and to be countable to the Magistrate wheresoever he shall call us thereto; hoping so to carry our selves, as not only

only to enjoy his concurrence with us on all occasions; but also that he will supply what is lacking, to make the Government entire, and likewise to make alterations in all things that shall happen to be amiss. In this doing we trust we shall not grieve the Spirits of the truly godly either at home or abroad, nor give any just occasion to them who are contrary-minded to blame our Proceedings.

By which Paper we may see, how respectfully and courteously these worthy and godly men walked towards the Magistrate, how much they give him as his due, even when he was exercising Erastianism in a great height, giving Rules and Directions to regulate them in admission to the Lords Supper, limiting them as to scandal, with divers other things, which they here but generally hint; and yet having given this sober salvo for quieting their Consciences, and guarding against offences; they do not refuse to go the length they have access, for doing their duty.

And thus I have shewed you, that they are much mistaken who imagine that our zealous Ancestors were of that humour, that they would take nothing except they got all which they thought due, and that they would do nothing except they got leave to do all, without any restriction put upon them by the Magistrate. That *Calderwood* in his History, p. 381. relates: *That the Synod of Fife, Anno 1597. instructs their Commissioners to travel with the Ministers, Barons, and Noblemen, that a supplication may be given in for the Ministers of Edinburgh, and Mr. David Black,*
that

that they may be restored again to their Flocks, and to behave themselves therein in the fear of God, and love of Christ and his Kingdom, faithfully and providently, with all dutiful reverence to the Kings Majesty. And p. 470. That Anno 1603. Mr. Robert Bruce desired his Majesties warrant of his reentry to his calling, or reposition to his place: And in that same Page, in his Letter to the Council of Edenburgh, he says: *And to this effect I craved that the Act of Council which stood against me, which closeth up my mouth, might be deleted; and that also I might have a warrant from his Majesty, to testifie his Majesties good will to my free and full Reposition.*

That passage of Scripture, *Exod. 10.26.*—*Not an hoof shall be left behind,* is frequently used, and very often abused and misapplied, as in the present case; *Moses* would not leave a hoof, and therefore Ministers should not preach the Gospel when the Magistrate permits it, except he permit Presbyteries, Synods, General Assemblies, and restore Peesbyterial Government entirely as it was. But there is so great disparity in the cases, that there is no ground for the inference of the one from the other: For *Moses* was made a God to *Pharaoh*, *Exod. 7. 1.* He was King in *Fesurun*; as he was extraordinarily raised up by God, so he was backed by the miraculous power of God, which plagued *Pharaoh* and the Egyptians.

Again, *Moses* and *Israel* were in possession of their Beasts, and had the extraordinary warrant and protection of God to secure their possessions. Further, *Moses* had also a reason for his refusal to leave

leave a beast ; for says he, *Thereof we must take to serve the Lord, and we know not with what we must serve the Lord until we come thither.*

If *Moses* had been a meer Subject of *Pharaoh*, and if *Pharaoh* had taken away all the Israelites Beasts, and had them in his possession ; if *Moses* being but a meer Subject, having no extraordinary call nor capacity, had refused to take any of the Beasts again, except *Pharaoh* would give every hoof, there would have been some kind of resemblance ; but as the case stands, there is none.

Moses would not part with what he had in possession, and therefore we should not take a part of that which we are deprived of, except we get all. *Moses* gave a reason why he could not leave a hoof, because they were to sacrifice, and they knew not what Sacrifices the Lord would require. But what reason can we give for that resolution, that if we get not all at once which is taken away, we cannot, we will not take any thing? there is no reason here but will and humour, and impotent pride.

Moses being extraordinarily authorized and assisted with the miraculous power of God, would not quit the grip of what he had in possession, and that upon a solid reason ; and therefore a people who have through their sin and the displeasure of God, lost the possession of the Church Priviledges they had, so that all is quit and gone, that they should take nothing till they get all ; that they should refuse the benefit of Preaching of the Gospel, till all their Assemblies for Government be restored, this looks like a judicial infatuation,
a proud

a proud heart in a poor breast, that hath mickle
 dolour to dry. They who are wise and humble,
 will see that 'tis their duty to be humbled under
 the ruines and desolations of the Church, and to
 take back any little that may be had, till the Lord
 send better.

Farm. I ingenuously acknowledg, that I am in-
 structed and informed by what you have said in
 several things, which I did not before understand :
 But Sir, I wonder how ye who are not indulged,
 labours so much to justifie the Indulged Mini-
 sters, when the Indulged Ministers, as I am in-
 formed, confess that they are wrong ; and if what
 they have done were to do, they would not do
 it.

Min. That is among the false reproaches that
 are cast upon the Indulged Ministers ; they grant
 that there are several things in the Magistrates
 actings , which relate to the Indulgence, which
 are not right ; as the Act of Instructions ; but for
 that Act, which is indeed the Act of Indulgence,
 the permitting and allowing the Preaching of
 the Gospel, they declare upon all occasions, that
 the Magistrate not only may, but ought to per-
 mit and allow the Ministers of the Gospel to Preach
 the Gospel ; and as for their own practice in ac-
 cepting the liberty of the peaceable exercise of
 their Ministry, when the Magistrate granted it,
 they have upon all occasions declared, that it was
 their duty to do what they did, and that they
 could not have had peace in their Consciences
 to have refused to Preach the Gospel in these
 *
 places

places, where they are settled, and several of them have declared this, when they saw themselves near to Death and Judgment, as for example, Mr. *Alexander Blare*, and Mr. *Alexander Wedderburne*.

Farm. It hath been very confidently said, That the Indulged Ministers have given in Bands to the Council, and that they should have sitten upon the Affize of some of these who were put to death for being at *Bothwellbridge*.

Minist. I know these to be vile lies, and Calumnies, which the Father of lies, and Malicious persons have devised, to render these Ministers and their Ministry hateful. The time was, when persons, who had muttered such odious Calumnies of honest Ministers, would have been hunted and hissed at, as graceless Persons; but now its a great part of some peoples work, to make up, and take up false Reproaches of Ministers: its a great Evidence of the absence of the God of Truth, that the Spirit of Truth, and the Spirit of Love, is far away from many of this Generation; and that a lying Spirit, the Devil, the Calumniator, the accuser of the Brethren, doth much prevail in the hearts of many, who are under the power of this lust of evil speaking: But I think it very observable, that the Lord hath so overruled the Devil and his Instruments, that the lies which they have spread, are so manifestly false, and so void of any appearance of Truth, that none but these who desire to believe lies of the indulged Ministers, will be deceived by them; and sober Persons are the more respectful to the Indulged Ministers, because they see the Devil, the Father of lies, is so busie in feigning

G

ing

ing false Accusations against them. They say, if there were not receivers, there would not be thieves; if there were not so many to listen to such Backbiters, and to take up such reproaches which others have made up, this Trade of Calumniating would decay. I hope, Landlord, you will think it your Duty after this, to discountenance, and drive away such Tale-bearers and Back-biters, by an angry Countenance, and sharp Rebukes, that they may not go on to delude themselves, in thinking the more ill tales they have of the Lords Servants, that they are the more Religious; but they may be brought to understand, that they are Satans Instruments, and doing his Work. As you would abide in the Tabernacle of God, and dwell in his holy Hill, beware of Back-biting, beware of taking up a Reproach against your Neighbour: Ye must not only forbear to make up, but ye must not take up, or as some read it, ye must not receive nor endure a Reproach against your neighbour.

Farm. I thank you for your good Counsel, or rather for minding me of the Counsel of God in the 15 *Psalm*, and I shall by the grace of God resist that lust of evil-speaking for the time to come. I hear much, that the Magistrate had an ill design in granting the Indulgence, and therefore the Ministers should not have accepted of it, and we should not hear them; for their Preaching, and our hearing, furthers that ill design.

Minist. I think we might be better employed, than in guessing at Statesmens designs. I have been credibly informed, that they who were the first movers of the Indulgence, had a very good design, and

none

none who knew them, will suspect them of mischievous designs; others I suppose, who were not much taken up with supernatural ends, or designs, yet they designed the Quiet and Peace of the Countrey; they desired not intestine Wars; they were content that they that would not hear Conformists, might be rid of Trouble and Fining; if any intended the Indulgence for division, they who divide upon that head, they work to their hand; but its an idle fancy to imagine, that the ill design of the Magistrate, who permits the preaching of the Gospel, will alter the Nature of the Gospel, or make the good design of the Gospel of no effect, or that it will vitiate the preaching or hearing of the Gospel to those who preach and hear the Gospel in that manner, and for that end, that the Lord hath appointed it to be preached and heard. Although a Magistrate did for some ill end, permit a faithful, skilful Physician to exercise his Office, the Magistrates ill design would not alter the nature, or hinder the Operation of the Physick given by that Physician, who did not approve of that ill design, but honestly designed the health of his Patients, and used the proper means for prescribing or recovering their health. And it's another reasonless conceit to imagine, that when a Magistrate assumes to himself some false Title, or unlawful power, that in that case no use may be made of that lawful Authority which he hath as Magistrate. Though *Cyrus* prefixed a great lie to his Proclamation which granted the *Jews* liberty to return and build the Temple of the Lord; yet the *Jews* were not such fools, as not to make use of

the good Decree, because the King said, that God had given him all the Kingdoms of the earth, and so arrogated to himself more power than God had given him. But I might have eased my self of all this trouble, by referring them to the many solid Vindications of the acceptance of the Indulgence, which are in several peoples hands; but that is your fault that ye seek only for those Papers which are against the Indulgence.

Farm. I would be content to read those Papers if I had them.

Minist. You might get them, if you would seek them.

Farm. I have heard of some short Papers of that nature; but I suppose the History of the Indulgence will never be answered.

Minist. These short Papers answered all that is to the purpose, in the History of the Indulgence.

Pr. That's a pretty device to decline the answering of that unanswerable Book.

Minist. Softly Sir! that Book is fully answered. I have seen two full Answers of it, and there may be more that I have not seen; and if you be here on Monday next, a sight of one of these Answers will clear you, that that book is not unanswerable.

Pr. I would be glad to see it.

Farm. Sir, you have much obliged me, by staying with me this night, and it will be a double obligation, if you come again to my house upon Monday, and bring that Answer with you. But it is now time to go to the Family-exercise. I shall desire of you both, that ye would be pleased to forbear to fall upon this question about the Indul-

gence,

gence, before my Family. Let the subject of your discourse at Table, and after Supper, be of purposes which may be fitter to prepare us for sanctifying the Lords day, than this doubtful disputation. I hear also from some of my Neighbours, that since their servants did withdraw from hearing Indulged Ministers, and from the duty of Catechising, they are become more ignorant and careless of learning the grounds of Religion, and are taken up with the jangling about the Indulgence, as if that were the one thing needful, not to go to the Kirk, but to the fields, to hear Preaching. And I hear their Masters complaining, that they are become more unruly, and make less conscience of doing their work, which makes me apprehensive, that all is not right in this new way they have taken; and to be ingenuous with you, I find, that my own withdrawing hath not been to my advantage; and this prejudice against the Indulged Ministers, who Preach edifying Doctrine, seems not to be to edification; I sometimes hear no Preaching upon the Sabbath, when there is no Preaching in the Fields, in the bounds; and I sometimes upon false Advertisements wander, seeking Preaching in the Field, and find it not; and sometimes there comes Preachers along, whose doctrine is little to Edification, which makes me often think, that those of my Family who go to the Kirk, and bring away edifying Notes of the Sermon, spend the Sabbath much better than I do; and when I compare their Notes with the Notes of some others, who go to the Field, who either bring away nothing, except it be a fair general, that the Preach-

er had brave work, and it was a wonderful Sermon, or some reflection upon the indulged Ministers, or some bitter invective against the Magistrate. I cannot but think, that they who go to the Church have the advantage of these who go to the Fields. And therefore I do not desire, that these of my Family who go to the Church, may be hindered from going; for I am edified by the Notes which they bring from the Church.

Minist. There are none of my acquaintance for any thing I can perceive, bettered by their deserting of the indulged Ministers; and this doctrine that the indulged Ministers should not be heard, is a Doctrine from which (for any thing I can see) no edifying use can be drawn. The Lord incline our hearts to follow after the things which make for peace, and the things wherewith one may edifie another.

! Farm. Sir, you are as good as your word, in returning. Have you brought the answer of the History of the Indulgence with you.

Minist. Here it is.

There are so many Papers already extant, and never yet answered, which from the Holy Scripture, and from the Writings of Orthodox Divines, do clearly demonstrate the lawfulness of the acceptance of the peaceable Exercise of the Ministry, granted in the Magistrates Acts of Indulgence, that it may seem a needless work to write any more upon that Subject. And if the sad Consequences which have followed upon this Question, did not render it serious, it were almost ridiculous to move the

the Question whether these of the outed Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, who after the *Migrates Act of Indulgence*, did either resume to their own Congregations, or not having access to return to their own Congregations, did upon the Invitation of vacant Congregations, and the Consent of the Ministers concerned, come to help these desolate Congregations, till they might have access to these Congregations where they were formerly settled. Whether these Ministers did right or not; and whether these Congregations did right in receiving, and countenancing their own Ministers, or in inviting and countenancing those Ministers who had no access to their own Congregations, but had access to the peaceable Exercise of their Ministry among them? They who will make a question, if it be lawful for Ministers of the Gospel to preach the Gospel to their own Congregations, or when they have not access to their own Congregations, if it be lawful to preach to desolate Congregations, which earnestly desire them to come and help them; they may make a question of any thing. And yet some have not only started this question, but resolved it in the Negative; and not only so, but they have raised a horrible Hue-and-Cry after these honest Ministers, for going to preach the Gospel in these Congregations, as if they had been Thieves or Robbers, and have charged them as Traitors, Betrayers of the cause, and what not? and have not only stirred up the People to disown and desert them, but have commended their deserting of them, as a necessary testimony, forsooth, against *Erastianism*: and thus one of the vilest and

most groundless Schisms that hath ever been in the Church, is made a forr of Martyrdom.

This Doctrine was first whispered to the People in private Conferences ; then it was dropped now and then in the Sermons of one or two ; then some rash youths made it a great part of their discourse in publick ; then we had Letters and Questions from *Holland*, with Advertisement, that the Press was travelling with the History of the Indulgence, which is now brought forth. And although any thing to the purpose in it, hath either been answered, or grounds laid down from which it may be answered, in the Answers which were given to the Authors Letters and Questions : yet because some have alledged, that this Book is so irrafragible in its reason, that the many who are against it, shall never be able to answer its Reason, and a friend of this Historian threatned, that he would make all the Indulged Ministers run before him ; and because the People who withdraw from the Indulged Ministers, are confident that this Book will never be answered, and so are hardened in their Separation ; and because there are many dangerous and destructive Tenets in this Book, and the Epistle prefixed to it, which if reduced to practice, would fill the World with Confusion ; I shall for Vindication of the Truth, and out of Love and Compassion to the People, who are deceived by this Book, and for the just Vindication of the reputation of the Indulged Ministers, who are very injuriously reproached in this History, examine all that looks like reason in this Book. And though

I be of their Opinion, that all that hath any shadow of Reason in this Book, might be answered fully in a few Pages ; yet seeing many are so possessed with a conceit of the Unanswerableness of this Book, that if any part of it were left unanswered, it would be alledged that it could not be answered, and this might be a snare to the poor people, who lay so great stress upon this Book ; I hope the judicious Reader will forgive me, that I put my self to so much labour, which to him seemeth needless ; for though it will not only seem, but be really needless to the Judicious Reader, yet it is necessary for the weak, for whose sake I especially put my self to this trouble.

The Historian gives his Book the Title of *The History of the Indulgence*, shewing its *Rise, Conveyance, Acceptance together with a Demonstration of the Unlawfulness thereof*. If under the name of Indulgence he comprehend all the Acts of the Magistrate, which he records in this History, he abuses the word Indulgence, and he abuses his Reader ; for there are several of the Acts which he relates, as for Example the Act of Instructions, and the Act of Fining the Ministers who kept not the Twenty ninth of *May*, which were not Acts of Indulgence. The Acts of Indulgence were only those Acts which granted the peaceable Exercise of the Ministry to some Presbyterian Ministers, notwithstanding of the Laws which established Prelacy, and enjoyned Conformity. But this Confusion runs through his whole Book, in which he would have his Reader believe, that the Indulged Ministers ac-
cepted

cepted of all these Acts, which he calls, or rather miscalls by the name of Indulgence ; and this confusion is one main foundation upon which his confused Babel is found. Whether he hath demonstrated the unlawfulness of the Magistrates Acts in which these Ministers are permitted, and allowed to preach the Gospel, or the unlawfulness of the acceptance of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, we will see when we come to his Demonstrations, and his answers to contrary Objections.

As for his Vindication of such as scruple to hear the indulged, it is a rare undertaking, and looks liker the attempt of a Knight errant, than of a solid and peaceable Divine ; for a scruple (as he might have learned from *Amesius* in his Cases of Conscience, 1 Book, and sixth Chapter) is a rash and groundless fear, and therefore he hath been very ill advised to undertake to maintain those who scruple to hear Indulged Ministers ; this was a rash and frantick act of Casuistick Chivalry ; his prowess would have been better proved and approved of all sober persons, in setting these people free from these rash and groundless fears ; for that would have been a right Vindication of those Scrupulous people, to have delivered them from their rash and groundless fears, which scare them from their mercies, and the means of their Salvation, and was an injurious cruelty to their souls.

The Historian designs himself a Presbyterian, in great Letters ; and yet this Book is a History of warring against Presbyterians ; and if it were fair War, it were more tollerable ; but as the War is groundless and unjust, so it is very foully managed,

naged, *non amice factum ab amico*. And though he be a Presbyterian in great Letters, in *uberiore forma*, and the Indulged stand before him in the frontispiece of his Book, in a very small Character, yet he should have remembred, that he was but one, and they were many, and it is not a Presbyterian practice, but a Popish Prank for one to stigmatize, censure and condemn many; his Designation should have put him in minde of Presbyterian Practice, and that among Presbyterians, matters are carried by the Plurality of voices, and not by the will of one how great soever he imagine himself to be; but there are so many things in this History, which are inconsistent with Presbyterian Principles, and which overturns the very foundation of Presbyterian Government, and of all Government; and there is so much Satyrick, insolent insulting over his Presbyterian Brethren, that he had some reason to fear, that he would be taken for some other sort of Creature than a Presbyterian: and therefore he hath done as the Painters they say were wont to do, when the Art of Painting was rude, and it was not easie to know where a Horse were a Horse or an Ox, what was defective in their Painting they helped it by writing, and in good great Letters wrote down, this is an Horse, and this an Ox, that none might mistake. I cannot but resent the injury, which he hath done to Presbyterians, and to their cause, in calling himself a Presbyterian, and then acting the part sometimes of a Pope, and sometimes of a Separatist, and venting extravagant, wild conceits, which are contrary to the received Tenets of Presbyterians; but I am hopeful that no
in-

ingenious Person will impute all this Authors conceits to Presbyterians, because he calls himself a Presbyterian.

Before I come to the History, I find an Epistle to the Christian Reader written by the Historians Friend, who was like-minded with him in these matters relating to the Indulgence. This Epistle is particularly directed to the suffering Ministers and Professors of the Church of Scotland. To these Christian Readers, he says, he need not tell them, that the knowledge of the Times, and what the Israel of God ought to do, should be their Ornament and Cognizance, distinguishing them from others, who are brutish in their knowledge. He hath an eye to that Scripture, *1 Chron. 12. 32. Among those who were ready armed to the War, and came to David to Hebron, to turn the Kingdom of Saul to him, according to the word of the Lord Ver. 23. There are some of the Children of Issachar, v. 32. And of the Children of Issachar, which were men that had understanding of the Times, to know what Israel ought to do: the Heads of them were two hundred, and all their Brethren were at their command.* These men of Issachar spoken of, were, as the Dutch Interpreters expound the place, understanding and expert men, which are able to give good Advice and Counsel at what time it were best to attempt any thing, or desist from it, whether in War, or civil Affairs, as *Esther 1. 13.* or in Husbandry and Countrey Affairs. Some Interpreters refer this to the knowledge of Astronomy, as *Diodate* shews: but others (says he) understand and take it

+ R. Mc Ward.

it to be only wisdom and sagacity, either natural, or gotten by long experience, to discern and know the very moment of Opportunities, a thing very important, whence ordinarily depends the good success of Affairs. Others shew, that these men of *Iffachar* were men eminently skilful, and endued with prudence, to know what was to be done. and when, and gave evidence of this sagacity at this time, in taking this fit opportunity in turning the Kingdom of *Saul* to *David*, and they were followed by their Brethren in this matter.

This Knowledge of the Times was not common to all the Professors in *Israel*; for if so, this Knowledge of the Times would not have been noted by the Spirit of God, as something remarkable in these men of *Iffachar*. And no doubt there were many *Israelites* who were taught of God, and were sufficiently distinguished from those who were brutish in their knowledge, who yet had not this Knowledge of the Times, to know when it was time to make War, and to make alterations in the State, in turning the Kingdom from the house of *Saul* to *David*. This Knowledge of the Times is very desirable, but every thing desirable is not a duty. *Moses* wishes that all the Lords People were Prophets; but it is not the duty of every one of the Lords People to be a Prophet, and to Prophesie. Again, there are several things which we are obliged to have and to do, which yet are not the Cognizance, or the Badges and Marks whereby they who are taught of God, are distinguished from them who are brutish in their Knowledge;
as

as for example, an eminent measure of Knowledge, of Prudence, of Love, of Assurance, these indeed, are excellent Ornaments, but they are not Badges and Marks common to all those who are taught of God, and distinguishing them from those who are brutish in their Knowledge; for there are many honest Professors who are taught of God, who have not attained to these eminent degrees of Knowledge, Prudence, Love and Assurance. Again, it's the duty of all Professors to obey the Law of God perfectly, otherways their defects in obedience would not be sins. But that perfection is not the Badg or Cognizance to distinguish those who are taught of God, from those who are brutish in their Knowledge. So that though that knowledge of the times were a thing which all *Israelites* should be adorned with, yet it would not be right to make it their Cognizance, or a distinguishing Mark to difference them from those who are brutish in their Knowledge.

But for any thing that appears from the Text or the Interpreters, which I have consulted this, Knowledge of the Times was a natural or political sagacity attained by long experience, by which these men of *Issachar* knew what was the fit seasons of making War and alterations in matters of State, which concerned all *Israel*.

Now for this sort of Knowledge of times, I suppose the Author of the Epistle will not say, that it is the duty of every Professor in the Church of *Scotland* to have this politick sagacity, to discern
the

the Seasons of making War, and making alterations in State matters : and much less is this politick sagacity and prudence, which is not ordinarily acquired, even by men imployed in State-Affairs, but by much exercise and long experience, to be made a Cognizance distinguishing those who are taught of God, from those who have not saving knowledge : for this knowledge of the Times is (as Interpreters think) a natural or politick knowledge, and so no evidence or mark of a Spiritual and supernatural estate. This is certain from the Scripture, that this Knowledge of the Times was a Knowledge which distinguished some of the Tribe of *Issachar* from the Generality of the people of *Israel*, and therefore this Scripture is misapplied, when this Knowledge of the Times is alledged to be the Mark and Cognizance of all who are taught of God, distinguishing them from those who have no true Wisdom, but are brutish in their Knowledge, and so like the beasts that perish.

This is an ill token that the Author of this Epistle hath stumbled in the threshold, and in the very Entry of his Address; and his stumbling is the more dangerous, because it may be a stumbling-block to private Professors, by putting this conceit in their heads, that they must either have the knowledge of the Times that the men of *Issachar* had, concerning the fit seasons of making War and peace, and of making State-alterations, or else they are brutish in their Knowledge, and are not taught of God. This were the way to put all Professors Male and Female, Lad and Lasse, to become
 Poli-

Politicians, and to take on them to know and determine what *Israel* should do, to determine what the State and Church should do. And thus they are diverted from studying to know what they ought to do themselves, and how they ought to rule their own Families, and set a work to dive into the intrigues of State-policy, and to plot alterations of States, and conclude when to make Wars; and to alledge that all who are taught of God, have that Knowledge of the Times which the men of *Issachar* had, is to deceive them, and make them imagine that they have that Knowledge which they have not, and to tempt them to meddle with things that are too high for them, and to crack their brains by racking them to reach those things which are beyond their Capacity, and to stretch themselves beyond their line, and pass the bounds of their Station and Vocation. Such flattering insinuations, which either puff up people with a conceit of their Wisdom, to manage the greatest and most important Affairs of Kirk and State, and that they are fit to guide their Guides, and break the Ice to them, as the Historian says in his 28 Questions and Vindication, hath done much harm to several well-meaning people, and put them from minding the duties of their particular Callings, and the Duties of their Christian Vocation, in the exercise of Faith and Repentance, and in giving diligence in the exercise of the Graces of the Spirit, to glorifie God, and enjoy him, and to make sure their calling and election, and to edify one another, and put them to be wholly or mostly taken up about the managing of publick Affairs, and
to

to break out of their own place, and pass the bounds of their Vocation, that they may right all that's wrong; and what confusion this breeds, both Reason and Experience may teach us. If Professors had been earnestly exhorted to do the duties of their Vocation, which the Lord calls them to, and to be earnest in praying to God for those whom God hath called to be Magistrates and Ministers, that they might be guided of God, and inclined to those things that are right in the sight of God, that they might under them live a quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty: This had been to put them to their duty, to walk in the way of God, and to have shunned many disorders and confusions, and to have obtained Israels mercy, whom the Lord led like a flock by the hand of *Moses* and *Aaron*.

But when every private Professor is taught, that he knows the Times, and what Israel ought to do, and that he is fit to guide the Shepherds, and go before them, in breaking the Ice; what can be expected from such Antiscriptural Conceits, but Confusion and Ruine? He adds, neither need I tell you how impossible it is to know what the present day and hour makes indispensable duty, without a just reflection on what is past; for the emergents of the present day can never be improved to the advantage of preventing the morrows Misery, without this — Now that you and I may be helped to a profitable reflection upon what is past, and improve it to it's just Advantage, the Lord hath been pleased in this unconcerned Soper of
D many,

many, to put it upon the heart of a Servant of his—to give you and me the following History, &c.

Ans. Doth he think that what he says here, is so evident, that every Christian Reader knows it without his telling them; if he had only said, that a just Reflection on what is past, is useful for the Time present; or if he had only said, that this Reflection on what is past, is useful for improving the emergents of the present day, it might have passed without Animadversion; but when he makes it impossible to know the present days duty, without Reflection on yesterday; when he says, that the present days emergents can never be improved without reflection on yesterday; He hath needlessly, by winding up his Assertions as high as his fancy could twine them, crackt their credit, and disoblighd his Reader, and provoked him to stand out against his Assertions, as injurious, in bringing him under a new impossibility and impotency which he knew not of. Now men love not to be brought under Impossibilities, of knowing and acting: for

1. It's neither Time past nor present, which makes duty, or makes us know what is duty; nor is it the remembrance of what is past, that makes men know what is their present duty: it's the will of God and not Time, which makes this or that our duty; and it's the Revelation of the Will of God that makes us know what's our duty the day, and what was our duty or error yesterday. *Adam*
knew

knew the duty of the day in which he was created, but he had no yesterday to reflect upon. Suppose a man lose all memory of what is past, yet he may by taking heed to his way according to the word, know his present duty. I have known some Persons have that weakness of Memory, that they did not remember that they themselves had spoken but a little before, and yet they made Conscience of speaking right when they spoke. It's a hard thing to bind a man who hath lost his Memory of things past, up under an Impossibility of knowing his duty in things present.

Again, he makes a just Reflection, not only upon a mans own actions, which he may more certainly know, but also a Reflection upon the Actions of others, which he cannot know, but by the relation of others, and written Histories, absolutely necessary for knowing the duty of the present day : Now this is yet a more intolerable Impossibility, to make our necessary present duty, dependent upon uncertain Relations, and it may be false stories ; how can men be assured, that their reflections upon these past things are just, when they know not whether the things be truly and justly related ? As for Exemple, this History of the Indulgence hath many falsehoods in it, and these falsehoods are not fit to instruct any what is the present duty, but are apt to deceive the Readers, and induce them to sin, and not direct them to their duty. But I see if I stay thus with the Author of the Epistle, it will be long ere I can come to the Historian ; and therefore I shall only

take notice afterward of these things which concern the Indulgence in this Epistle. But ere I go further, I cannot but here remember what I heard a Judicious Gentleman say of the Author of this Epistle, *viz.* that he used to get as high in his expressions, as his fancy could reach: this is ordinary in Romantick Writers, but it's a great fault in any who pretend to write Truth, especially in Divines. And this puts me in mind of what I heard that great, judicious, and acute Divine, Mr. *James Wood* say, that the study of the flourishes of Oratory, was dangerous in a Divine; because as these flourishing Rhetorickations do divert the Hearers or Readers from the simplicity of the Gospel; so they who follow them, are in hazard in that pursuit to run over the bounds of truth, and to fly higher than Scripture and solid Reason do allow. The Author of the Epistle, hath frequently in these few lines, flown higher in his fancy, than Scripture or solid Reason will allow:

1. In making the knowledge of the Times, to know what Israel ought to do, the Cognizance and Badge of the Professors of the Church of *Scotland*.

2. In making it impossible to know the present duty, without Reflection on the Time past.

3. In making our necessary duty depend upon humane Stories, which are often false, and at best very uncertain.

4. In

4. In saying, that the emergents of the present day can never be improved, without this Reflection on Yesterday.

Seeing the Author of the Epistle hath assaulted the Indulged Ministers with Questions, I shall make use of the same Weapon, that he may have fair play; and my first Question is, Whether he hath any Scripture or Reason to prove these four Assertions last mentioned? My next Question is, what Warrant hath he to say so confidently, that the Lord put it upon the Heart of the Historian to give us this History? Does he think that the History was inspired by the Lord into the Heart of this Historian? In this History there are many falshoods in matter of Fact, many false Reasonings; there are Contradictions and Inconsistences: Now the God of Truth puts it not upon mens hearts to write Untruth. There are many bitter Reproaches and Calumnies, much of the Wrath of man, many things which are not for Peace and Edification; the design of the Book is a vile Separation and Schism: These things are not from God, who is Love, who is the God of Peace, who hath commanded us to do all our things in love, and not to forsake the assembling of our selves together.

My third Question is, How he will refute those who alledge that the Writing of this Story came in the Head and Heart of the Historian, as it came in *Dauids* head and heart to number the People? The Lord was angry against Israel, and he left

David to the temptation of Satan, and to his pride, and he numbred the People, and this brought on the Plague. The Lord was angry at the People, who were weary of the Ordinances, and were disposed to lightly Ministers; and the Lord in his righteous judgment, may justly leave men to their Pride and Self-conceit, to Write and Print Calumnies against Ministers, &c. for a Plague upon those who despise his Servants and Ordinances, so filling them with their own ways : this Book is a great Plague to such people, hardning them in their neglect of Preaching, Catechising, to the increase of ignorance, unbelief, ungodliness. The dismal effects which he spake of, are not the effects of the Magistrates granting, or the Ministers accepting of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry. Pag. 3. he charges the Indulged Ministers with a fearless making and meddling with the stated enemies of Gods work, ere they had mourned over former unfaithfulness and miscarriages, and ere Brethren equally concerned, were consulted.

Ans. How knows he that they were fearless, or that they had not mourned for their former miscarriages? by what evidence doth he thus judge of the frame of the hearts of his fellow-servants, especially when he was at such a distance from them when they medled in this matter? and I suppose he will not conclude, that they had no fears nor tears, because they did not Print them and send them over sea, seeing they have been and are mourners, of whose tears the World gets not notice; and I am inclined to think, that the deepest
for-

forrow makes least dinn. Every mourner hath not the opportunity of publishing their tears in Print; and many Mourners have put Books to the Press, whose Modesty would not suffer them to mention their own Tears. As there is rashness in his judging concerning the inward frame of his Brethrens heart, in intruding into those things which he hath not seen; so there is something more than rashness, in his alledging that Brethren were not consulted; for he might have known, if he would have been at the pains to have enquired, that Brethren were consulted, and that the generality of the Ministers in *Scotland*, were for Ministers returning to their own charges; and that those who had not access to their own charges, might upon the Invitation of vacant Congregations, go and exercise their Ministry among them. But I perceive that he is against all meddling with the present Magistrates, because of the ill they have done and do design. He looks on all making and meddling with them, as Defection, and the cause of further Defection; for, saith he, what else but further Defection could be expected as the issue and result of those medlings? the Author of the Cup of cold Water, advises to stand aloof from all listnings to proposals coming from them, or making any to them; and he conceives we are called of God to take this course, as that way wherein alone we can expect his approbation and countenance, Pag.

41.

Again pag. 42. he saith, it passeth his ken what Address can be made to him, except it be to tell, we can make none, or to beseech him

D 4

to

to forbear to persecute the Mediators Embassadors; and that he seeth not, and hopes never to see with his eyes; who can see how Addressees to them in Church-matters can consist with the resentment of their Usurpation of Christs Throne? and after in that same Page, We have nothing to seek from any who sets in our Masters Chair of State; God forbid that ever we should be seen to bow or beg to them, while they sit there; however when we are passive, we may make use of what liberty is given, yet it's our Peace, &c. to abstain from seekings and receivings from those who stand in such terms of Opposition to him.

Ans. This is new Doctrine, a new light which I suppose come never to light till now; if the Author hath learned it of any, I wish he would tell us who are his Authors. I doubt if he can shew us a Precedent going before us in this way in which, and (which is more strange) in which alone we can expect Gods Approbation and Countenance, I wonder how he hath come to have so great Confidence in this untrodden Path, that Subjects are called of God to keep at such a distance from their Rulers, as to stand aloof from all listnings to their Proposals; And that Subjects are called of God, to stand aloof from making any Proposals to their Rulers: And that this Course is the way, and the only way wherein they can expect Gods Approbation and Countenance, are strange and bold Assertions, which should not have been obtruded upon us by his Conceit. A Divine call, and Divine approbation should have been con-

confirmed by Divine Authority; what knoweth he, but the Lord may put some good motion in their hearts? he hath put good things in the hearts of Idolaters, Heathen Princes, to which the Lords People did listen, and to which they were obliged to listen, and for which they found themselves bound to bless the Lord, who had put such things in their hearts; the Lord can put good Motions in the Hearts of ill Men, and to refuse to listen to those Motions which are good and of God, is to refuse to listen unto God. How can this consist with the Honour which all Inferiours, Servants, Children, Subjects, are bound to give to their Superiours? I suppose there is no Superiour who would not judge it to be a manifest Contempt in his Inferiour, if he should keep at such a distance from him, as that he would neither hear what he proposed to him, nor yet would propose any thing to, nor desire any thing of his Superiour.

I cannot see how a man can bind himself to keep such a distance from any man, Superiour, Equal or Inferiour, as not to listen to any thing he says, be what it will. This standing aloof from all listnings to any Proposals made to us, and from making any Proposals to them, if we like not those that are made by them, seems inconsistent with common Civility and humanity. This is a new sort of an Act of Intercommuning: Let us hear his Reasons for it, pag. 41. first, saith he, This is the most proper means to convince them of their Wickedness. I am so far from being of his Opinion, that I think it were a very proper Way,
to

to provoke them to use all Violence against such who would neither hear them, nor speak to them; who would neither seek nor take any thing from them, this would appear to them a great height of Insolence and Contempt; and Insolence and Contempt in Inferiours towards their Superiours, is no proper means to make Superiours better, but hath a native tendency to tempt and provoke them to be worse.

Secondly, he saith, That this is the alone expedient to preserve our selves free of all compliances with them, and in good terms with Jesus Christ; and this, says he, is best Policy, to beware of sinning him out of Soul or sight, by touching with that which his Soul hates.

Ans. As we must not sin against Christ by complying with Rulers in any thing that is sinful; so we must not sin against him, by despising Dignities, and by carrying our selves insolently towards those whom he hath commanded us to honour: but we should both honour them, and forbear to comply with them in any evil. We should not refuse to hear their Proposals, if they make any to us, but we should hear them, and if they be good, entertain them; and if they be evil, we should with meekness of Wisdom shew the evil of them, and give our Reasons why we cannot comply with them. Thus we both keep our selves free from the sin of contempt of lawful Authority, and from the Contagion of any sinful Proposal; and what know we, but solid Reasons given to the Magi-

Magistrate, may instruct and edifie him, and divert him from pressing that which is not right.

Thirdly, saith he, this is the way to preserve Unity among the Remnant.

Ans. This is none of the means of Unity prescribed in the Scripture; and if it be not among the means of Union which God hath appointed, I know not what ground we have to expect that it will be effectual for that Union which God hath appointed to be among his People.

2. This was not the way that our godly and learned Ancestors took: new ways are ordinarily dividing ways. This way would quite cast out the Magistrates and the Nonconformists; and this is the thing which the Papists have been driving this long time; and it would certainly break the Nonconformists: for if this Motion should take with some, it would not take with Judicious and Sober Persons, for they would perceive that this were the High-way to render the whole Nonconformists hateful to Magistrates, as a pack of sullen, humorous People, who would neither seek, nor take any thing from them, nor hear them, nor answer any thing to them, except it were, that they would neither make nor meddle with them, and that they would make no Address to them; except it were to tell them that they could make none to them. Yet I perceive, that the Author, pag. 42. though he is for abstaining from seeking and receiving any thing from them, yet he

he thinks we may make use of what liberty is given by them. When I read this, it put me in mind of some petted Children, and of some Persons under deep Melancholly, who will not seek meat nor receive it from those who would give it to them; yet if it be set down beside them, they will eat it: it's hard enough to make any considerable rational difference betwixt receiving liberty, and making use of liberty given. And I can see no reason why we may not receive and seek that which we may take and make use of when it is given; there is more Humor than Reason in this distinction. Yea, I perceive that the Author is not against all seeking; for in that same page he allows of one Petition to be put up to them, and that is to beseech them to forbear to persecute the Mediators Embassadors; if we may beseech them to forbear one evil, why may we not beseech them to forbear other evils? and if we may beseech them to forbear to do evil, why may we not beseech them to do good? The Prophet *Isaiah* when he is speaking to a very wicked Generation, whom he calls Rulers of *Sodom*, and People of *Gomorrha*, he puts these together, *Cease to do evil, learn to do well.*

In that same page the Author limits this keeping aloof as to Addresses to the Magistrate, to Addresses in Church-matters: he hath foreseen the Objection which would be made; if we may make no Addresses to them, then how shall Wrongs be righted, Justice administred? &c. For it is not to be supposed that Rulers will right those who are wronged, except the Wrong be represented to them,

them, and recourse be had to them for Redress. But if we may make Addresses to them for righting Wrongs done to us in our Persons, or Estates, why may we not make Addresses to them for righting the Wrongs that are done to Christ and his Church? If Eraastian Supremacy doth not bar us from making Address to them, from making and meddling with them in seeking what is due to us from them, and receiving it when they give it; why should it hinder us to make and meddle with them, in seeking that they would do right to the Church and Servants of Christ? and when they do any thing right in taking off any undue Restraints which they had laid formerly upon the Church or Ministers, why may not that right be received? For the Magistrate, as a Magistrate, is bound to do right to the Church, as well as to the Common-wealth; and his encroachment upon Church-privileges, does no more make void that power which he hath from God for doing good to the Church, than it makes void the power that he hath, for doing good to the Common-wealth. The Author of the *Cup of cold Water*, charges them very high, as having passed all bounds of Civil Authority, p. 4. and yet condemns not Addresses to them in civil matters; why then should he condemn Addresses to them in Church-matters, because of their passing the bounds of that civil Power about Church-matters which they have from God? The main ground upon which he would infer, that there should be no making nor meddling with the Magistrate, is the Supremacy, and other sins which are mentioned in his Preface, and in the *Cup of cold*

Gold Water, and in the History of the Indulgence

It should be our earnest Prayer that the Lord would open the Eyes, and convince the Consciences, and soften the Hearts of our Rulers, that they may in time repent of their sins; and it's our duty to be humbled, weighted and ashamed, not only because of our own sins, but also because of the sins of our Rulers; and we have the greater reason to take confusion of face to our selves because of their sins, because it is the sins of Subjects which ordinarily provokes God to leave their Rulers to their own Lusts, and the temptation of Flatterers and Devils to bring on Judgment upon themselves and their People.

We may see our sins in the sins of Rulers; if Christ had been in Truth as he was in Word, acknowledged alone Head and Lord of his own house; if his Divine Wisdom, and Sovereign Will had been only observed and followed in the matters of God; and if mens wills, and humours, and conceits, and interests, had not been mixed in these things; and if those to whom the Lord had given the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, had kept close to their Spiritual Function, it might have prevented all encroachments upon the Spiritual Power of the Church. O that the Lord himself would teach Rulers with a strong hand, that no other power is good, but that which is of God, and to God, and no other power but that which is of God, by whom Kings reign, is for their honour and interest; all other power is vanity, nothing, and worse than nothing, and will be to their loss, shame and sorrow. *Darius* found that that Decree

cree which seemed to confer too much honour upon him, in pretending to make him God alone for thirty days, was but a miserable cheating snare; as Flatterers are a great plague to Rulers, so wise and faithful Instructors, Counsellors, and Reprovers, who out of pure Zeal for God, and true love to Rulers, shew them what is right and wrong in the sight of God, are great blessings to them.

It is not every one that is fit to reprove equals, far less any Superiors, and least of all Rulers; and it is not every one that hath some fitness, that is called of God to this work. They who are called to it, must manage this difficult work with all Wisdom, Faithfulness, love to the person of the Ruler, and respect to his Authority, that in discovering his sin, his Authority be not brought into Contempt. As they must not lessen their sin, so they must not make it worse than it is. If we must not lye upon the Devil, far less upon those whom the Lord hath called Gods: it were also good to say nothing of them behind their backs, but what we could say to them, if we were called to it, and had access: for to vent things of Rulers behind their backs, and when called to an account, to deny or mince and extenuate, and put another face upon it than it had at first, is not ingenuous dealing.

It is found in sad experience, that bitter invectives against Rulers published by uncertain Authors, and which overlashes and passes the bounds of verity, irritates and provokes Rulers, and
makes

makes them think that such invectives flow from hatred to their persons, and contempt of their Authority, and tempts them to reject the truths which are mixt with these falshoods; and thus many by overdoing, undo all that they intended to do. I wish the Author of the Preface, and *Cup of cold Water*, and of the Letters, had not overlash'd and pass'd the bounds of Truth in their exaggerations of the Magistrates sins, and in uttering things derogatory to their Authority; as for example, that no Magistrate either Heathen, Turk or Christian, ever arrogated such a Supremacy.

Some have arrogated to themselves the Deity, and to be God alone, as *Darius* did by signing the Decree. *Herod* arrogated to himself to be God, and not man. And that allegiance that they have delecte the apprehension of that eternal God, who is above them, would fasten that upon them which many think the greatest profest Atheists, though they intend it, yet can never attain unto it, to get the apprehension of a Deity rased out. It's also said that they have the purity of enmity at, and implacability against all who desire to be faithful and loyal to Christ. And elsewhere it is said, If it be not an abuse of language to call them Rulers whose Government is pure Tyranny. They have much real guilt, why should we make ourselves guilty in alledging upon them that which we cannot prove? The Lord hath forbidden to speak evil of any man, and in a special manner he hath forbidden to revile Rulers; as we should beware of idolizing Rulers, so we should beware
of

of despising Dignities ; if the pains and time that hath been spent in telling how our Rulers had been taken up in earnest Prayers and Endeavours to make them better, it might have been better both for them and us.

The exaggerating of their sins to scare us from all Addresses to them, from all seekings and receivings, hath a direct tendency to put them and us in a state of hostility, and render us hateful to Rulers, as Persons who are utterly alienate from them, and will have nothing to do with them. It may seem a very cleanly-like conceit to well-meaning people, to forbear all making and meddling with Rulers, who have highly provoked the Lord, and vexed his People ; but this is but a conceited cleanliness. The first Magistrate that *Israel* had to do with, was a grievous Oppressor of the Lords People, and an Idolater, and an insolent despiser of God, who makes nothing of God, *Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice, and let Israel go ? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go :* And yet the Lord sends *Moses* and *Aaron* to him, to desire him to let *Israel* go to serve him in the Wilderness ; and after he hath given that blasphemous insolent answer, full of tempting of God, they insist humbly to pray him to let them go, *Exod. 5. 1, 2, 3.* And they are many times after, sent by the Lord to *Pharoah* with the same desire. It were easie to multiply instances of this nature, but this one is sufficient ; here are frequent Addresses made by the Lords servants to a most Godless, Atheistical Blasphemer and Persecutor of the Lords people, and that in

a religious matter, It's for liberty to go and worship God.

If a company of Christians were taken at Sea, by a company of profligate godless Pyrates, who were stronger than they, might not the Christians desire of them Liberty to worship God together? who will question it? And if an address may be made to such Ruffians, who neither fear God nor regard man, and who have no Authority over the Christians, but keep them Prisoners by strong hand; how much more may Addresses be made to the Magistrate, who, whatever be his sins, hath Authority from God to do good, and the same Authority that a godly Magistrate hath; and to draw out this power by Petitions, and to take the benefit of the exercise of it? When the Magistrate doth any good to the Church, and undoeth any ill formerly done, it is not a touching of any unclean thing, but a making use of that Authority which is the excellent Ordinance of God. I shall shut up this with a Testimony of precious Mr. Rutherford, in his *Divine Right of Church-Government and Excommunication*, Chap. 24. Quest. 20. pag. 539, 541. *Now the Magistrate Heathen, as Magistrate, even Nero, when the Church of God is in his Court and Dominions, hath the same Jus, the same Authority and Official Power, to be Keeper of both Tables of the Law, and to defend the Gospel, and to command the Preachers and Synods to fulfil their charge, and to see that the Officers do their Duty; and to punish dumb Dogs, Idolaters, Excommunicate persons,*

persons, to drive away with the Sword false Teachers from the flock. He hath, I say, the same Magistratical Power, while he is a Heathen, as when he is converted to the Christian Faith; and he is equally head of men when Heathenish, as when Christian. I shall add no more of this, but that as the Magistrate hath retracted the Act of Intercommuning made against several of the Subjects, so I wish that the Author of this new Act of Intercommuning against the Magistrate may retract it also.

In the 4th page of the Preface, he says of the Indulged Ministers, That they were men in as ill case to have made or medled in the concerns of Christ and his Church, with the men with whom they had to do in their circumstances, as ever any godly men in our Church were.

Answer. I see this Author hath a way of judging the inward Frames and Cases of others, and even of those who live at a great distance from him; not only in regard of place, but also of time. By what Evidence he knows the ill case of these indulged Ministers at the time of the Indulgence, and by what Evidence he knows the cases of all the godly men, which have been in this Church, (for this he must know, or else he could not determine that the Indulged were in as ill case as ever any godly men in this Church were) I cannot conjecture. He should either have held his peace of their ill case, or else he should have instanced it; for as he hath left it,

in this uncharitable time, some people may suspect much worse than any thing he hath to say : It may be his Informations and Reasons may be false, or not concludent ; and it may be his Reasons, if he have any, conclude only against some of the indulged ; whereas he hath now left it upon them all , that they were in as ill case as ever any godly men in this Church were. But suppose they were in an ill case, will that prove, that it was unlawful for them to go and preach in these Parishes which were either their own, or else being destitute, invited them ? The exercise of their Ministry might be, through the Blessing of God, an excellent means to better their case. I have heard it of some, who could well judge, that he had heard some of these Ministers before affirm, that they Preached much better since their return, than they did before they were put out. If he knew his Brethren to be in an ill case, he should have told them of it, and have heard them what they had to say, and then have considered, whether it were fit to have Printed their Case, and Published it to the world. Whatever truth may appear in his dilating this further, there is no great appearance of Charity in this Method that he hath taken ; as we should think on the things that are true, so on the things that are lovely, and speak the truth in Love. What ground the Author hath for this Faith, by which he believes that the smothering of what he hath said concerning the ill case of his Brethren, would have met him at
the

the Lord's Tribunal, he knows best himself; but I hope he doth not intend to obtrude his belief upon others, as an evidence of the truth of what he believes. The belief of appearing before the Tribunal, should keep us from rash judging of our Brethren, Rom. 14. 10. *But why dost thou judge thy Brother? or, why dost thou set at naught thy Brother? We shall all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ.* And vers. 4. *Who art thou that judgest another mans Servant? to his own Master he standeth or falleth.* Matth. 7. 1. *Judge not, that ye be not judged.* Jam. 3. 1. *My Brethren, be not many Masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation.* Jam. 4. 11. *Speak not evil one of another (Brethren) he that speaks evil of his Brother, and judgeth his Brother, speaketh evil of the Law, and judgeth the Law: But if thou judge the Law, thou art not a doer of the Law, but a judge.* I do not see how he can clear himself of rash judging, except he knew certainly the case of all the Godly men that have been in the Church; and because Godly men may be sometimes in a better, and sometimes in a worse case, he must know their case when it was at the worst, or else he cannot make a parallel of their Case, and the Case of the Indulged Ministers: Or else he must know, that the Case of these Indulged Ministers was so ill, that no Godly men could be in a worse case: and how he can certainly know the one or the other, except he have it by Revelation, which I think he will not pretend unto, I cannot imagine. I think it would

not be rashness to say, that his confidence in this matter hath gone further than his evidence could carry it; for as fearless and untender as he thinks these Indulged Ministers, I suppose they would have been afraid to have intruded so far in the comparative judging of the illness of the case of any one godly Minister, let be of so many.

In this next Section he charges the Indulged Ministers with this new step of defection, and says, That it hath had most deplorable effects, and that it's like to be more fatal to the poor languishing remnant, than any step of defection to which ever any godly men were left in the Church of *Scotland*.

If it be found that the Indulged Ministers have not made defection in their going to exercise their Ministry in the places to which they are indulged, nor in their Acts that were previous to their going to these Congregations, his charge will be found false, and he must find out some other causes of these deplorable effects of which he speaks, than the practice of these Indulged Ministers. There are many good effects of the exercise of their Ministry in these Congregations; several have been converted, many edified and built up in their most holy Faith. The renting and ruine of the Church, which he speaks of afterward, will be found to have proceeded from other causes, which I love not to name, and not from the Ministry of these Ministers in these places, or from their practices which went before their Preaching in these Congregations.

The first degree of their defection, as we heard before, was this, That they made or meddled with the Rulers at all. He is against all Addresses to them; and therefore according to his opinion, when the Magistrate called for these Ministers whom they intended to indulge, they should have sent them word, We will neither make nor meddle with you, nor can we make any Address to you, except it be to tell you we can make none. Now how this could have consisted with common civility, and how it could have consisted with the duty of any Subjects towards Rulers, especially with the duty of Ministers, who should be examples to others in all dutiful, respectful behaviour towards Superiors, I cannot understand; I suppose the Author will not get many to vote with him in this vote of Non-addresses; I doubt much if he was of that opinion himself at the time of the first Indulgence: but we had enough of this before. 2. He taxes their embracing of the Indulgence. 3. their giving thanks to the givers. 4. Their not giving Testimony against their invasion. 5. Their going and continuing to exercise their Ministry in these Parishes to which they were Indulged; for he desires them with much earnestness to deliver themselves from this Indulgence, by relinquishing those Congregations.

The embracing and accepting of the Indulgence, is taken ordinarily by those who quarrel with the Indulged Ministers, for an accepting of all that is in the Magistrates Acts that relate to the Indulgence, and so they alledge they accepted

the Instructions, &c. But this is a manifest mistake, the Indulged Ministers know best themselves what they did make use of in the Magistrates Indulgence; and Mr. *Hutchensons* speech shews what it was that they acknowledged as desirable and refreshing to them, even the free liberty of the publick exercise of their Ministry, under the protection of lawful Authority. They shew they had been under a long restraint; and this liberty and free liberty (as it is called afterward) of the publick exercise of their Ministry, is opposed to that civil restraint which the Magistrate had laid on them, by reason of which they could not, without hazard or great disturbance, publickly exercise their Ministry, as wanting the Magistrates Protection, and being exposed to the hazard threatened in the penal Statutes, which did inhibit the publick exercise of the Ministry. This publick exercise, free from this restraint; or this publick exercise under the protection of lawful Authority, is the same with the publick peaceable exercise of the Ministry; this they acknowledge as a favour; and why may they not accept of freedom from restraint, which had been upon the publick exercise of their Ministry, and accept of the Protection of lawful Authority, and give thanks for it? The peaceable exercise of the Ministry is a great benefit, and it's acknowledged, that the publick peaceable exercise of the Ministry, is by the Magistrate; and therefore it was very fit that they should thankfully acknowledge this.

It is a wonder to me, when I hear men who
should

should have more than common ingenuity, alledging so confidently, that the Indulged Ministers received and accepted their Ministry, and Instructions to regulate them in their Ministry, from the Council; and that they alledge this after they have seen what M. H. spoke in their name, who acknowledges no more as received from the Magistrate, but liberty or freedom from the restraint that had been upon their Ministry, and their Protection of lawful Authority in the exercise of it; though he had said no more, I think this should have been sufficient to have prevented such false alledgements; but when he hath said further in the face of the Council, that they received their Ministry from Jesus Christ, and full prescriptions from him for regulating them therein, that yet they will alledge that they received their Ministry and instructions from the Council, is even astonishing, and shews what force humours and prejudices have upon mens minds.

I come next to his Questions; and he asks,
 1. *If they could after this their acceptance and giving thanks to the Council, have withdrawn from that appearance, and settled themselves before Christ Jesus the King of his Church, and with a sweet serenity of soul have had confidence to offer their thanks to him for being helped to witness a good Confession against the wickedness of this Invasion made by the overturners of his work, upon his Royal Prerogative, who built the house, and must bear the glory; for it was either then or never, that this was to have been done?*

Ans.

Ans. I perceive this Author hath a way of intruding upon the secrets of his Brethren; as before he judged and condemned their frame and case, so here he sets up a new sort of Inquisition, and will have his brethren give an account to him and the World of the serenity of their souls after they had been before the Council: Although I am in charity bound to think, that these Ministers had this serenity of soul after what they had done before the Council, and that they can declare this when they find themselves called thereto; yet I think this new Inquisition is a dangerous preparative. I see not what Authority he hath to put his Brethren to give an account to him, and to the World, of the frame of their soul, nor what obligation lieth upon them to give such an account to him; if he have a particular Warrant to erect such an Inquisition-Court, let him shew how he came by it; if he have no particular priviledge for this, then any one may do what he does; and if every one may make such Inquisition, and all the Lords people and servants be obliged to answer every Inquisitor that searches after the secrets of their souls, this would be much more intollerable than the Popish Inquisition, and Auricular Confession; for this makes every man that pleases, an Inquisitor, and obliges the party inquired, not only to round his secrets in the ear of one, but to publish them to the whole world, and that upon the Inquisition of persons who are rashly suspicious, or prejudged against them and their way.

How often have good men, after they have done what was good and acceptable to God, been assaulted with temptations, and perplexed with doubts and fears, about what they had done? I hope he will not say that they were upon the inquiry of persons prejudged against them, and the good which they had done, and who were waiting for their halting, obliged to tell those prejudged persons and the whole World, that they were under such doubts and fears about what they had done; for beside many other evils that would follow upon this, it would give occasion of speaking evil of the good which they had done, and harden those who were adversaries to the good deed they had done, and might occasion others to doubt of the lawfulness of a good action.

Beside, this sort of Inquisition, if it should take place, would draw out secret sins to the view of the world, and make them publick scandals, and would raise suspicions of scandals without ground; as for example, if a suspicious person might inquire and oblige any other person to answer to this question, Could ye, after ye come from such a place or such company, have confidence to offer thanks to God for helping you to overcome the temptation ye had to uncleanness, theft, drunkenness, and to bear witness against the sins of the persons ye were with? If the person be silent and give no answer, the suspicious Inquisitor will be more confirmed in his suspicion, and readily conclude the man guilty. If the man be really guilty, and yet clears himself, he sins by lying.

If he confess his guilt, he makes a scandal in an unwarrantable divulging of his sin; and though it may be he hath behaved himself blamelessly, yet a tender person upon such an enquiry may readily be put to a demur, and suspect that he may at least have omitted something which he ought to have done, and so cannot give any present account of the serenity of his soul in that matter, which will encrease the sinful suspiciousness of his Inquisitor; and though he be altogether blameless, and his Conscience serene, yet the very questioning of such things, is apt to breed suspicions and scandals.

But to come to his Question, His design in it is to find the Indulged Ministers guilty by their own Confession of the neglect of a Testimony against the wickedness of this Invasion made by the overturners of the Work of Christ.

The Question is, Whether it was the duty of those Ministers at that time, to give in a Testimony of that nature? He determines, they should have done it then or never. Now he hath so conceived his Question, that whether they answer yea or nay, he will conclude them guilty for not giving in such a Testimony as he requires at that time; for if they say, they were helped to witness a good Confession against this wickedness, then he will conclude, that then it was duty to give in such a Testimony as he requires at that time; for to make a Confession good, it's required that it be seasonable; an unseasonable Confession is not a good Confession, for the seasonableness of a Confession, is one of those things which
are

are required to the goodness of it ; and a good thing is made up of intire causes, but any defect makes a thing evil.

Again, it cannot be said, that men with serenity of soul can have confidence to give Christ thanks for helping them to give an unseasonable Confession, or a Confession out of season. But again, if they answer, that they were not helped by Christ to give such a good Confession ; then he will conclude, that they are guilty of neglecting to give in that Confession at that time, seeing it was a good Confession, and so seasonable, which if they had given, they would have done it by the help of Christ, and would have had matter of thanksgiving ; and seeing they have not done it, they have not been helped by him to that which was good and their duty at that time. Thus whether they answer his Question affirmatively or negatively, he will conclude them guilty.

The Author made his Address, as he says, not as an acute disputant, but as a poor, blunt, plain, open-hearted man, in a few plain Questions ; he should not after such a profession of plain-dealing in the very Entry, begun with Sophistry, with a Caption from many Interrogations. *Solomon* says, *Prov. 9. 8. Reprove not a Scornor, lest he hate thee.* So that a man may forbear to reprove a Scornor, and yet not be guilty of a sinful neglect ; but by such a captious Question as this, any man who hath been with, and heard Scorners, will be found guilty ; for if ye spear at him, were ye helped by Christ to witness a good Confession against such a Scornor, or to give a good reproof
to

to such a scorner? if he answer, that he was not helped to give him a good reproof, then ye conclude that he omitted good, and so sinned in not reproving him; whereas *Solomon* forbids to reprove him. If he say, he gave him a good reproof, then he calls that good which the Scripture forbiddeth; or if this question be moved to one who hath not reprov'd a man when he was not in a case to receive reproof, suppose when in drink, or in the height of rage, or when in such distemper, and under such prejudice, as the reproving of him would hinder him from doing some good that he were about to do, and in all probability make him worse; if the person perceive not the captiousness and sophistry of the Question, but answer yea or nay, he will be intangled; but such may easily answer the Question thus, 1. That they did not reprove such a person in such a case: and 2. That it was not good to reprove him in such a case, or at such a time; and that therefore he was not guilty of neglecting a good reproof, because it was not seasonable to reprove at that time.

If the Prefacer would have dealt as plainly as he promised, he should have plainly proved, that these Ministers should at that time have given in such a Testimony as he requireth. The command that requires the making of Confession, is an affirmative Precept; and though it be obliged at all times, yet doth not oblige to give a Testimony at all times; we must never deny the truth, but we must not ever make Confession of it, as all Casuists grant. We do not hear that

Moses

Moses and *Aaron* made any formal protestation against *Pharaohs* Blasphemy and avowed Rebellion against God; they heard him say, *Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice, to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go:* They make no Protestation nor Declaration against this blasphemous Speech, and avowed Rebellion against God; they only shew their Warrant, and humbly insist in their Petition: and yet these extraordinary Embassadors of God, were in another manner of capacity for doing this, if it had been necessary and seasonable, than ordinary Ministers are; read *Exod.* 5. 2, 3. Nor do we hear that the other Children gave any written or verbal Protestation against the making of the Image, and Proclamation to worship it: Nor did *Daniel* give any written, subscribed, or verbal Declaration against the making, signing, publishing of that Decree which discharged all Petitions to be given to any for thirty days, but to *Darius*, which was to make him God alone: All that they did, was, they did not obey, but acted contrary to those godless Decrees, and chused rather to suffer death than obey them. Nor did our Saviour speak any thing before *Herod*, though a vile man, when he was before him. Christ held his peace a long time before the Council, and when he spoke, he gave in no written or verbal Protestation against the Council, it's constitution and corruptions, nor against the sentence they pronounced against him as a Blasphemer. Nor when *Paul* compeared at *Rome*, do we hear of any Protestation against the monstrous abominations and per-

persecutions of Nero. Many Martyrs and Confessors did forbear to make publick Protestation against the Idols and Idolatry of their Persecutors; and all that many of them said, was this, *That they were Christians, and upon that suffered.* How many, both private Christians and Ministers, have appeared before the Council, since the Supremacy was established, who did not think themselves obliged to give in a written or verbal Confession, Testimony, or Protestation against the Supremacy, and the Invasions made upon the Government of the Church? and yet the Author of this Epistle urges none of these with his Queries; but only the Indulged Ministers, though they have somewhat to say for their forbearance of any such Protestation which others had not, seeing they were called to the Council in a time when the Magistrate was relenting somewhat as to the severity formerly used, and they were called to get some relaxation from the restraint laid formerly upon them; and their irritating of the Magistrate, might not only have prejudged themselves of that freedom, but also have been prejudicial to others who were in expectation of it, who might very readily have blamed them for their imprudency in tristing their Protestation with that season, not only to their own prejudice, but to the prejudice of others. And I leave it to the Consideration of indifferent persons, whether or not the Magistrate would in all probability have said, These men and others of them made no Protestation against us when we turned them out, and subverted their Government,

ment, but now when we begin to shew favour to any of them; they grow more insolent, and therefore it's best policy to forbear our favours, and to use severities. And seeing all these Brethren, and the whole Presbyterians in *Scotland*, were concerned in the Invasions made upon the Church, and were concerned in the bad effects that might have followed upon the irritation of the Magistrate in that juncture of Affairs; if it had been fit for a few private Ministers, without the concurrence of all concerned, or at least without their counsel and advice, to have given in such a Testimony or Protestation as the Author requires: and it's well known that no such concurrence was offered, nor such advice given to these Ministers by the rest of their judgment, who were concerned in this matter.

I shall not repeat what the Author of the Answer to the *Countray-mans Scruples* anent the Indulgence, hath said, concerning Testimonies, in which he hath shewed from Scripture and solid Reason, the rashness and unreasonableness of those who have condemned the suffering Ministers, and the Indulged Ministers, for not giving Testimonies: He hath excellently discovered from Scripture when Testimonies are to be given, and when not; when they are seasonable, and when unseasonable: He hath also shewed how written Testimonies which Synods had prepared when Prelacy was coming in, particularly the Synod of *Fife*, were obstructed by the Magistrates raising of these Synods; and that they who had no clearness to make any use of the Indulgence, did obstruct the written Testimony which was

prepared against the evils which were in the complex acts, which related to the Indulgence; he hath also shewed how many Testimonies have been given by word in Preaching, and before the Council, and by suffering, and by not obeying the Instructions of the Council.

I shall only shew, that the Ministers, who first appeared before the Council, at the first Indulgence, did witness a good Confession in the presence of the Council.

They declare that they had received their Ministry from Jesus Christ; and after design themselves the Ministers of Jesus Christ: They speak of their Ministry as *Paul* did of his Ministry, *Acts* 22. 24. *The Ministry*, saith he, *which I have received of the Lord Jesus*. And by the way we may take notice, that the Ministry is not a meer Power or Authority, but comprehends the exercise of that Authority, the exercise of the Ministerial Office; for *Paul* speaks of finishing the Ministry which he had received, which unquestionably points at the exercise of his Ministry; and they design themselves as *Paul* designs Ministers, *1 Cor.* 4. 1. *Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ*. *2 Cor.* 11. 23. *Are they Ministers of Christ? I speak as a fool, I am more*. They who quarrel this part of their Confession, must fall first upon the Apostle *Paul*, or rather upon the Holy Ghost; for the Apostle spoke as he was moved by the Holy Ghost.

2. They declare that they had received from Christ full prescriptions for regulating them in their Ministry; as they had acknowledged Christ
the

the giver of the Ministry, so they acknowledge him the Law-giver from whom they have the prescriptions to regulate them in the Ministry, both in their entrance into it, and exercise of it : then they declare that these prescriptions of Christs are full. This excludes all other prescriptions, though they had said no more but that they had received prescriptions from Christ to regulate them ; this would have sufficiently excluded all other prescriptions : For the prescriptions being the prescriptions of God, we must not diminish from them ; and so we must not admit any Rules contrary to them, or that derogate any way from them ; and we must not add unto them, because they are his words, *Prov. 30. 5, 6. Every word of God is pure—add thou not to his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.* And then seeing Christ hath given these prescriptions to regulate Ministers in their Ministry, this shews that these prescriptions are a perfect Rule ; a Rule must be perfect, else it is not a Rule, as our Divines maintain against the Papists in pleading for the perfection of the Scripture ; seeing Christ hath given prescriptions to his Ministers to regulate them in their Ministry, these prescriptions are perfect, else they were not sufficient to reach the end of regulating. His work is perfect, he is faithful in his house, as a son over his own house, he hath finished all the work that was given him to do.

But when they further assert, that these prescriptions were full, this did clearly exclude all other prescriptions for regulating them in their

Ministry as superfluous, and as Additions to that which God had made full and perfect; but last of all, this is one of the Lords prescriptions, that we should not add to his Word, nor diminish from it, *Deut. 4. 2.* Again, that is another of his prescriptions, *that they do all in the Name of the Lord Jesus*: And seeing they are the Ministers of Christ, and their work, the work of the Ministry, received from Christ, any that will not shut their eyes may see that they behoved to be regulated by his prescriptions alone in the matter of their Ministry.

3. They confess Christ to be their Judge to whom they were countable in the discharge of their Ministry: for these are the words which Mr. *Hutcheson* spoke in their name, *We have received our Ministry from Jesus Christ, with full prescriptions from him for regulating us therein; and must in discharge thereof be accountable to him.* This doth clearly evidence that they behoved upon their greatest peril to adhere closely to these prescriptions which they had received from the Lord Jesus: Seeing they were to give an account unto Christ how they had discharged their Ministry according to his full prescriptions, and that they could receive no other prescriptions besides Christs prescriptions to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry.

4. They declare how desirable and refreshing the exercise of this their Ministry was to them.

5. They declare what power they acknowledged in the Magistrate; it's not a lawless but lawfull

Authority which they acknowledge ; they acknowledge no other power in the Magistrate but what is the Ordinance of God ; for so they describe lawful Authority the excellent Ordinance of God : They declare it's the work of Magistrates to protect the Ministers of Christ in the exercise of their Ministry.

6. That they purposed and resolved to behave themselves in the discharge of their Ministry with that wisdom and prudence which became faithful Ministers of Jesus Christ.

7. They declare that they continued in their known judgment in Church-affairs; they did let the Magistrates know that they had not altered their Judgement in Church-affairs, that they were still Presbyterians; and all who have any knowledge of the Judgment of Presbyterians, know that they own Christ for the alone head of the Church, and fountain of Church-authority, and that they are as opposite to Erastianism as they are to Prelacy. That they are so far from

ascribing a Supremacy of spiritual power to the Magistrate, that they profess that the Magistrate hath not any power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven committed to him; and that it doth not belong to the Magistrate to ordain or depose, suspend, excommunicate, or to exercise any Church-censures; and that it doth not belong to him to form Church-Canons, or to prescribe Instructions for regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry; and that they are of that Judgment,

*Their judgment
is known from
the Confession
of faith, chap.*

23. Art. 3. ch.

25. Art. 6. ch.

30. Art. 1. ch.

31. Art. 3.

ment, that no Magistrate, nay, nor all the powers on earth, though they were united, can dispose of Ecclesiastical matters according to their Wisdom or pleasure; seeing the things of the house of the God of Heaven, must be done according to the wisdom and pleasure of the Lord, and not according to the wisdom and pleasure of Creatures.

These and many other Tenets are known by all who know what Presbyterians are, to be their known and professed Judgement. Now seeing they declared their continuance in their known Judgement, and adherence to their former principles, and that to the Magistrate, and had declared before their resolutions to behave as faithful Ministers of Christ, and that they believed the account they were to give of their Ministry to Jesus Christ. They did shew to the Magistrate, that they did not, nor could not approve of power or acts of the Magistrate which were contrary to their Judgements; for that had been so far from becoming the faithfulness of the Ministers of Jesus Christ, that it could not consist with common Ingenuity.

8. And they clearly enough insinuate that there was an opposition betwixt their known Judgements and the actings of the Magistrate in subverting Presbyterial Government, and setting up of Prelacy, and other actings contrary to Presbyterial Principles; some whereof I mentioned before: This opposition is clearly insinuated and imported, while they say, *And to demain our selves towards lawful Authority, notwithstanding of our known*

known Judgment in Church-affairs, as well becometh Loyal Subjects: for if the Affairs of the Church had been then according to their known Judgment, that [notwithstanding] had been impertinent, and could have had no sufferable sence. But Church-affairs being settled by the Magistrate, contrary to the known Judgment of Presbyterians, some might have alledged, that Presbyterian Ministers would not be Loyal towards lawful Authority; to obviate this they say, That notwithstanding their known Judgements, they would behave as Loyal Subjects.

9. And hence they declare to the Magistrate that there was no disloyalty in their Principles or practice; of their Principles, that their known judgement in Church-affairs, and the faithful discharge of their Ministry, according to their known Judgement, did well consist with loyalty, and with that respect which from a principle of Conscience they did owe to lawful Authority, though it did not consist with some of the actings of those who were in Authority.

10. They modestly declare the low esteem they they had of themselves, in saying they were the unworthiest of many of their Brethren; and they so far from selfishness, in desiring to partake of this liberty alone, that they express their desire that others of their Brethren may be sharers of the liberty which they enjoyed.

It appears from what is said, that these Brethren witnessed a good Confession before the Council; and the Author of the History of the-Indulgence, hath in this respect done right to these

Brethren, and good service to the Church, in Printing the Speech which Mr. *Hutcheson* spoke in their name before the Council. If any object, that their Testimony is not good, because they do not expressly and *in terminis* testify against the Invasions made upon the Church. I would desire these to consider, that in saying so, they condemn the Testimonies of many Martyrs, who in their Confessions only expressed the truths which they did believe; and some of them only in the general asserted that they were Christians. They condemn also our Confession of Faith, which doth not so expressly, and in so many words refute and reject many dangerous and damnable errors, but doth only assert the truths opposite to these errors; yea, they condemn the Testimony of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures, which is good and perfect, and yet doth not *in terminis*, and expressly mention every error which is contrary to the truth, but leaves the refutation of many of these errors to be gathered by good consequence from what is said in the Holy Scriptures; and they condemn also that good Confession which Christ witnessed before *Pontius Pilate*, in asserting himself to be a King; for he doth not expressly mention and reject all the errors which are contrary to his Spiritual Kingdom.

And seeing I am speaking of Testimonies, I shall mention what the Indulged Ministers, who were called before the Council for not keeping the 29. of *May*, declared in the face of the Council. As they had agreed, that Mr. *Hutcheson* should declare that the Magistrate had not a power formally

mally Ecclesiastical, and that they could not receive Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical from the Magistrate: So Mr. *Hutcheson* to prevent the Councils giving them any such instructions, desired that their Lordships would be pleased not to burden them with impositions in the matter of their Ministry, wherein they were the Servants of Christ. And after Mr. *Alexander Blare*, who was called before Mr. *Hutcheson*, had shewed that he could not receive such instructions to regulate him in his Ministry; Mr. *Hutcheson* before he was called, spoke against their *L. L.* imposing Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical for regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, who were the Servants of Christ in these matters: And after when he was called, he shewed that a formal Ecclesiastick power could not be allowed to the Magistrate; and several others of them spoke to the same purpose. As these Ministers have not received these Instructions, so they have declared to the Council, that they could not receive them; beside what we observed from M. *Hutchesons* Speech at the first Indulgence, there are here other things observable.

1. That he designs them Impositions, and so he shews that they looked upon them as incroaching and intrenching upon their Ministerial calling.

2. In asserting, that the Magistrate had not a power formally Ecclesiastical, he testified against *Eraastianism*; and did further shew, That the Magistrates work is not to form Rules or Instructions which are formally Ecclesiastical; for all Acts which
are

are intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical, must be elicited by a power which is formally Ecclesiastical; the giving instructions formally Ecclesiastical, is the formal effect of an Ecclesiastical Instructor; as it is not proper for the Magistrate, but for Physicians to give medicinal Receipts, which must be drawn from the art or faculty of Medicine; Nor is it proper for the Magistrate to make a Physical Directory to regulate Physicians in their giving of Physical Receipts; for this were an intrenching and breaking in upon the Physicians Calling. So it is not proper for the Magistrate to make Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical; for these must be drawn from the Word of God, seeing they are for the ordering of the Matters of God; and when there is need of forming any such Rules or Instructions, it's the proper Work of those to whom the publick Explication and Application of the Word of God belongs: The forming of such Canons, hath in all Ages been the work of Ecclesiastical Synods, who had not the power of the Sword; and consequently the forming of such Rules is not an Act of the power of the Sword.

3. In asserting, That in their Ministry, and these matters which were the exercise of it, they were the Servants of Christ; they did shew that they could not admit of any Impositions which would prejudice their Masters service; and that in these matters they were not at their own disposal, and must not act ex proprio arbitrio, nor pro hominum imperio, but ex Christi obsequio; that is, That they were neither to be ruled by their own will, nor the will of men, but by the will of Christ in these
Mat-

Matters. They did put in the words formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, because the Magistrate may make civil laws about Church-matters, as is acknowledged in the second Book of Discipline, Chap. 10. where it is said, That he may make Civil Laws and Constitutions agreeable to Gods word, for the advancement of the Kirk and policy thereof, ithough he may not make Canons intrinsically Ecclesiastical.

These were good Confessions made before the Magistrate by the Indulged Ministers, and the fullest I know hath been made by any before the Magistrate: Although persons whil'e they are under prejudices against these Ministers, make nothing of any thing these say or do; yet when these humours and prejudices are removed, and the carriage of these Ministers is impartially considered, ingenuous and unbyassed persons will not only clear them of the unjust aspersions cast upon them, but commend them, and wonder that that they have been so unjustly abused, and that they have so long born so many injuries with so great patience. The attempts of the Author of the History of the Indulgence, to make nothing of these Testimonies, as they discover the strength of humour and prejudice, so the vanity of his attempts will appear when we come to examine them. I come to the second Question in the Epistle to the Reader.

Secondly, saith he, *let me ask, Are they so very clear and confident in the case, that they cannot only in dealing with men, hold up their face, and affirm without hink or hesitation, that this is their*

rejoycing, even the Testimony of their Conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God they have had their Conversation before all men, and more abundantly towards these backsliding Rulers, before whom they appeared, now declared enemies to the work of God, and Invaders of his Throne and Prerogative? But are they also content to be carried before the Tribunal of Christ with this acceptance from those which have exaundered their Lord and Master in their hand, and to have the quality of their love to the coming of his Kingdom, and their Loyalty unto Christ Jesus now opposed, and put from the exercise of his Royal Government by the party indulging in this very Indulgence, tried by such a test? It were fit sure to think on this, and lay it to heart, for each Receiver may lay his account with it, that soon or syne he shall be put to it.

Ans. Before I come to answer this Question, I cannot but advertise him, that in saying, without any limitation or restriction, that not only the Magistrate hath exaundered Christ, but also that Christ is put from the exercise of his Royal Government, he hath laid a stumbling-block before weak and ignorant people, which may occasion them to imagine that Christ is quite vanquished, and denied of all Authority, and put from all exercise of his Kingly Office. There are such loose Rhetorickations in the Cup of cold Water, which may occasion simple people to think, that Christ is quite dispossessed of his Crown and Throne. If any will read the Answer to that Question in the larger Catechism, How doth Christ

Christ execute the Office of a King? they will see, that he exerciseth his Kingly Office, not only by Governing his Church visibly, in calling it out of the World, in giving Officers, Laws and Censures, but also in bestowing saving Grace upon the Elect; rewarding them for their obedience, correcting them for their sins, preserving and supporting them under all their temptations and sufferings, restraining and overcoming all their enemies, and powerfully ordering all things for his own Glory, and their own good; and also in taking vengeance on the rest who know not God, and obey not the Gospel.

Now I suppose the Author of the Letter, will not imagine that the Magistrate intended to put Christ from the exercise of his Royal Government, as to many of these Acts of his Kingly Office. It's a sad truth, that the Magistrate hath subverted Presbyterian Government, which is a part of the visible Kingdom of Christ; but it is not the all of Christs Kingdom; wherever there is a visible Church called out of the World, where the Word of God is preached, where the truth is born witness to, and the Sacraments Administered, there Christ executeth his Kingly Office, and there is something of his visible Kingdom. I do not think that the Author of the Epistle will say, that the Magistrate intended that there should be no Church, nor any Preaching of the Word of God in *Scotland*.

2. What ever may be said of the Act of Supremacy, which is so terribly vast, that even Mr. Burnet in his last *Dialogues* insinuates, that it
can-

cannot bear a strict *examen*; and that some expressions in it must carry with them a tacite exception; yet it is manifestly false, that the Act of Indulgence did any way oppose the exercise of Christs Royal Government; for the Act of Indulgence allowed Christs Ministers to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom, to keep Kirk-Sessions, which is one of Christs Courts.

As for the Question; I wonder how he dare call the simplicity and godly sincerity of these Ministers in question, or how he durst doubt of their Loyalty to Christ, and of their love to the coming of his Kingdom. I am bound to think, that it was the desire which they had of the coming of his Kingdom, which moved them to desire the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, that they might make full proof of it in Preaching, Baptising, celebrating the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, Catechising, Visiting, exercising Discipline without disturbance, which they could not have attained in an unsetled ambulatory Preaching. As these Ministers think themselves bound to praise the Lord, and to be thankful to the Magistrate for the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, so they could not according to these thoughts that they then had, and still have, with peace in their Consciences, refuse to take this opportunity of the peaceable, setled exercise of their Ministry.

I would enquire of him how he knows that this acceptance of freedom from that restraint which had been upon the publick exercise of their Ministry, will be a test before the Tribunal of Christ,

Christ, by which their love to the coming of his Kingdom, and their Loyalty to Christ will be tried. Acceptance of a freedom of this nature, if considered simply in it's own nature, is no test of love to Christ, or Loyalty to him ; because this is a favour, that a Minister void of Grace, may be desirous of, and take, as any man who is restrained from the exercise of his calling whereby he hath his livelihood, will willingly accept of freedom from that restraint. And so a Minister who hath no love to Christ, who hath been restrained from the exercise of the Ministry, will willingly accept of a relaxation from that restraint ; and therefore this acceptance simply considered, being a thing common, and not a thing accompanying Salvation, is not capable of being a mark or test of Love or Loyalty to Christ. It were an impertinent and foolish Question if one should come to a poor man come out of Prison, with this Question, Are ye content to be carried before the Tribunal of Christ with your acceptance of freedom from your Prison in your hand, as a test of your love to Christ ? If the man had any knowledge, he would answer, that acceptance of freedom from Imprisonment, is common both to good and bad ; and therefore he behoveth to seek for other marks and tests of his love to Christ : if he would further urge and say, If your coming out of Prison, be not a test of your love to Christ, and your Loyalty to him, then it was not lawful for you to come out of Prison. The man might answer, that there are many things lawful and commendable, which are not marks and tests.

tests of Love and Loyalty to Christ. Now it seems this is the thing that he would be at, that if this acceptance of freedom, &c. be not a test or mark of Love or Loyalty to Christ, that then it was sinful. I think it a strange thing to see a rational man professing, and as I suppose, designing plainness, making such captious confused Questions. I shall not say, that the Author's Questions are the Questions of a blunt man; but all the point I can perceive in his plain Questions, is in the captious confusedness of them.

His third Question is ; *If they believe that Christ who purchased his Church, &c.* In this Question, if the Indulged Ministers believe that Christ who purchased his Church, &c. lives to make Intercession, &c. And there are some things which he supposes the Indulged Brethren will not, nor cannot deny, which are not so clear as to be beyond the possibility of denial; as for example, That Christ procures by vertue of the price he hath paid, the execution of the written vengeance upon all who strive with him for state and supremacy, &c. And afterward, That the Mediator who is set down at the right hand of God, intercedes and pleads by his blood, by his wounds and passion, for the execution of the purchased and promised vengeance. I do not remember that I have read this before, that the price Christ hath paid, doth procure vengeance; the purchasing and promising of vengeance, are expressions new to me ; mens sins procure or deserve vengeance, and God threatens vengeance. Purchases and Promises are of things that are good.

good. I shall only move this Question, By what evidence was he assured, that none of the Indulged Ministers would or could deny, that Christ intercedes and pleads by his blood, by his wounds and passion, for the execution of vengeance? I do not remember, that ever I heard or read this assertion, that Christ intercedes by his blood for vengeance, before I read it in this Epistle; and I have had occasion to speak with others who were surpris'd with it, as an uncouth and strange assertion, which they had never heard before; and therefore there was great rashness to alledge, that none of the Indulged Ministers would or could deny such an uncouth assertion, which is neither clear by it's own innate light, nor commonly received among Divines; yea, it is so far from being an opinion commonly received, that I know not if the Author of the Epistle will find any who have used such expressions as these which he uses in this matter. I find several Divines restricting Christs Priestly Intercession unto the Elect; and they look upon his Priestly Office, as an Office of Grace; and herein they distinguish Christs Kingly and Priestly Office, which the *Socinians* would confound; that the Priestly Office, and that part of it, the Priestly Intercession, is for the Elect, and is not for punishing of enemies, as the Kingly Office is. *Essenius* in his *Triumphus Crucis*, pag. 279. shews the distinction of the Kingly and Priestly Office of Christ, by ascribing to the Priestly Office the Sacrifice and Intercession, and the punishing of enemies to the Kingly Office, and after in the same page he shews, *That the Inter-*

G

cessions

cession differs much from the Kingly A&ts, among which Kingly A&ts he reckoneth the compescing or quashing of enemies ; and he sheweth, That even Crellius, though he labour to confound the Kingly and Priestly Office of Christ, yet he assigns some differences , and this is one, That it belongs to Christ, as a King, to punish; but to him, as a Priest, it belongs only to expiate the sins of the people.

And Maresius in his Systems of Theology, in his 10. Common-place, Thef. 57. taxeth the Socinians for confounding Christs Kingly Office with his Priestly ; and in his Annotations subjoyned to his last Edition of that System, he says, *As these two Offices must not be divided, or drawn assunder, or separate, so they should not be confounded ; for Christs Priestly Intercession in Heaven, is only for the Elect, but his Royal Power is exercised, as in calling and protecting the Elect, so also in restraining, compescing, and punishing the enemies of his Church; and in that same 10th. Chap. Thef. 55. Annot. A. In which respect, the blood of the New Covenant is said to cry for better things than the blood of Abel, Heb. 12. 24. for the blood of Abel requireth vengeance, but the blood of Christ seeks and obtains Grace and Peace.* And the excellent Doctor Owen in his Exercitations prefixed to the Continuation of the Exposition on the 3, 4, 5. Chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Exercitat. 8. pag. 117. saith, *For neither did Christ as King, expiate and purge our sins, which could be done only by a bloody Sacrifice ; nor doth he as Priest subdue his enemies and ours, which is the work, and whereunto the power of a King is required — in brief, as a Priest,*

he interposeth with God for us; as a King, he acts from God towards us. Pag. 119. For the Kingly power of Christ is intended unto his enemies, the stubbornest of them, and those who are finally so; but Christ is a Priest offered and intended only for the Elect. Pag. 122. speaking of the Offices of a King and Priest, considered absolutely, he says, That the Office of a King is founded in nature, the Office of a Priest in Grace; the one belongs to men, as Creatures capable of Political Society; the other with respect unto the supernatural end only. Pag. 123. For that the Office of Priesthood is that faculty and power, whereby some persons do Officiate with God, in the name and on the behalf of others, by offering Sacrifices, all men in general are agreed. And thereon it is consented also, that it is in it's entire nature distinct from the Kingly Power and Office. Pag. 124. For every Priest, as we have shew'd, acts in the name, and on the behalf of men with God; but a King in the name, and on the behalf of God, with and towards men, as to the ends of that rule which God hath ordained. The Priest represents men to God, pleading their cause; the King represents God to men, acting his Power — for all the acts of the Priestly Office, belongs to oblation and intercession; and these effects consists either in 1. A verruncatione mali, or procuracione boni; these they affect morally only by procuring and obtaining of them. The Acts of the Kingly Office, are Legislation, — destruction of enemies, and the like. Pag. 129. The special nature of his Sacerdotal Intercession, which consists in the moral efficacy of his Mediation, in procuring Mercy and Grace. And

in his Exposition on the 5th. Chap. v. 1, 2. where the Priestly Office is described; For every High-Priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God for men, *וְעַל* is sometimes vice or loco, in the stead, Joh. 10. 11, 15. Chap. 13. 38. Sometimes pro only, as it denotes the final cause, as to do a thing for the good of men, 2 Tim. 2. 10. And both these senses may have place here; for where the first intention is, the latter is always included; he that doth any thing instead of another, doth it always for his good; and the High-Priest might be so far said to stand and act in the stead of other men, as he appears in their behalf, represented their persons, and pleaded their cause, and confessed their sins, Levit. 16. 21. But in their behalf, and for their good and advantage, to perform what on their part is with God to be performed, is evidently intended in this place; and pag. 130. he expounds the things pertaining to God *לַיהוָה*; & *לְעַל* the Expression is elliptical and sacred; but what is intended in it, is sufficiently manifest, the things which were to be done with God, or towards God in his worship, to answer the duties and ends of the Office of the Priesthood; that is, to do the things, whereby God might be appeased, atoned, reconciled, pacified, and his anger turned away; see Chap. 2. 17. and pag. 136. He sheweth from the Text, That Compassion is a qualification of an High-Priest for their relief, who are sensible of their ignorance and wanderings; and therefore are apt to be cast down and discouraged; and that it is a qualification required in the Priest, and necessary unto him for the aforesaid end, — So it is said of our Saviour, the great High-Priest

Priest, that he made reconciliation for the sins of the people, and Intercession for Transgressors.

I shall only add one other, and that is Thomas Goodwin B. D. in his Treatise entituled, *The heart of Christ in Heaven, to sinners on earth*, Part. 2. 188. First, (saith he) this Office of High-Priesthood, is an Office erected wholly for the shewing of Grace and Mercy,— the Office of the High-Priesthood, is altogether an Office of Grace, and I may call it the Pardon-Office, set up and erected by God in Heaven, and Christ he is appointed the Lord and Minister of it; and as his Kingly Office, is an Office of Power and Dominion, and his Prophetical Office, an Office of Knowledge and Wisdom; so his Priestly Office is an Office of Grace and Mercy; the High-Priests Office did properly deal in nothing else; if there had not been a Mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, the High-Priest had not been at all appointed to go into it; it was mercy, reconciliation, and atonement for sinners, that he was to treat about, and so to Officiate for at the Mercy-seat; he had otherways no work, nor any thing to do, when he should come into the most Holy place. Now this was but a typical allusion to this Office of Christ in Heaven; and therefore the Apostle in the Text, when he speaks of this our High Priests being entered into Heaven, he makes mention of a Throne of Grace—and this is the very next words to my Text, Chap. 5. 1, 2, 3. verses, in which he gives a full description of an High-Priest, and all the properties and requisites, that were to be in him. Pag. 189. the great and essential qualifications there specified, that were to be in an High-Priest, are Mercy and Grace.—It's said he was

ordained for men.—that is, for mens cause, and for their good—pag. 190. thus you see the ends which he is ordained for, are all matter of Grace and Mercy—the qualification that was required in an High-Priest, was, That he should be one that could have Compassion—Mercy and Compassion is that which is here made the special, and therefore the only mentioned property of the High-Priest as such, and the specifical essential qualification that was inwardly and internally to constitute him.

The Reader will find much more to this purpose in the place cited; but from what hath bin cited from the Authors mentioned, whose Books are common, and no doubt have been seen by the Author of the Epistle, he might have seen, that it was great rashness to suppose that none would or could deny, that Christ by his blood did intercede for vengeance.

Those Authors mentioned, have a far other up-taking of Christs Priestly Office, and of that part of it, his Priestly Intercession by his blood; for they think his Priestly Office was wholly an Office of Grace, and altogether an Office of Grace, founded in Grace and Mercy and that Mercy is an essential qualification of a Priest, as a Priest; that it's an Office for men for expiating sin, and not for punishing it; that the designe of it is mercy and grace; that the Priestly intercession is only for the Elect, and in this distinguished from Christs Royal Power, which as it is for protecting the Elect, so it is for punishing the enemies of his Church.

2. But suppose Christ did intercede by his blood against some; I enquire at him, how he knows

knows that he intercedes by his blood for vengeance upon the Authors of the Indulgence? what knows he but some of them may be elect? I am sure he will not say that the blood of Christ which was shed on earth for the Elect, doth plead against them within the vail in Heaven; if he say, that he knows they are all Reprobates, he knows more than the Author of the *Cup of cold Water* knew in the year 1678. for pag. 40. he says, *It may be there are some of the Elect so far left at present, as to run along with this course.* I hope he will not take on him to say, They have sinned the sin against the Holy Ghost. If by vengeance he mean eternal vengeance, he must conclude them Reprobates; if he mean temporal vengeance, how knows he that Christs blood pleads for that? We see *Aaron* as Priest, stood betwixt the dead and the living to stay the Plague; he made an atonement to avert the wrath of God, and not to bring it on; *Numb.* 16. 46, 47, 48. And the Plague which came after the numbring of the people, is stayed by building an altar, and offering burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, *2 Sam.* 24. 25. Again, whatsoever Christ intercedes for by his blood, he obtaineth it; now how knows he, that temporal vengeance will certainly come upon the Authors of the Indulgence?

It belonged to the Priest as Priest, to bless in the name of the Lord for ever, 2 Chron. 23. 13.

May not Sovereign grace avert the temporal judgment which mens heinous sins have deserved? who can set bounds to the Grace of God, *who hath Mercy on whom he will have Mercy*, and hath

shewed mercy to some of those who were the chief of sinners?

3. Suppose that were granted, that Christ did by his blood intercede for vengeance, and that the Author of this Epistle could condescend upon the particular persons against whom Christ intercedes, and that he intercedes against the Authors of the Indulgence, because of the complex of this deed of the Indulgence; yet this would make no discrepancy betwixt Christs Intercession in Heaven and Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech upon earth; for except he proves that Christ intercedes for vengeance upon them, for their taking off the civil restraints of penal Statutes, and granting the peaceable exercise of the Ministry; all he says, is nothing to the purpose: For Mr. *H.* and the Indulged Ministers did give thanks for this, and not for the complex of the Indulgence; for they never gave thanks for the Instructions. He will never prove that Christ as King, willeth the execution of vengeance upon Magistrates, for taking off such undue restraints; and much less will he be able to prove that Christ as Priest intercedes by his blood for vengeance upon that account. And as for the Prayer which is in the end of Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech, *That the Lord would bless his Majesty in his Person and Government, and their L. L. in the publick Administration*; that was according to the Lords Command, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2, 3. where it is expressly said, *That this praying for Kings, and all that are in Authority, is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour.* And what they meant by his Majesties Government, is clear,

clear from what they said before in the Description of Magistracy, which they design lawful Authority, and the excellent Ordinance of God. Seeing Mr. *Hutcheson* spoke according to the good and acceptable will of the Lord, revealed in his word, this allèdged discrepancy betwixt Christs Intercession and their Speech, is one of the Authors roaveries; a Melancholy dream, with which he may affright himself; but the Indulged Ministers are not such weak Fools, as to be affrighted with his many terrible words of terrour, trembling, confusion of face, shame and astonishment. This minds me of the censure which I saw of him in an Answer to the History of the Indulgence, that he hath *πάθη ἀνευ λόγων*, passions without reason. The Indulged Ministers believe, that they have followed the Lords will, in not slighting the opportunity of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, which the Lord in his good providence did offer to them; and they look upon the direction which they had from the Lord in this matter, to chuse the good, and refuse the ill; and upon the Lords assistance of them in the exercise of their Ministry, and his helping them hitherto, to run with patience in the course of their Ministry, notwithstanding of the contradictions, and false reproaches they have met with from some, from whom they expected better things; and upon the blessing of the Lord in the exercise of their Ministry, as the fruits of Christs Intercession, so far are they from being confounded and terrified with reflecting upon the Intercession of Christ.

There

There are other things in this 3d. Question, which may be denyed, at for example; *That our Rulers in affronting Christ have outdone all that ever went before them, and were resolved never to be outdone by any who should come after them.* What? no not by the Council at *Jerusalem*, who condemned him of Blasphemy, and after commanded his Apostles not to speak at all to any man in the name of Jesus?

But the Gentlemans observation holds here; for he goes as far as his fancy can go; he minds me of a Drunken man in the times of Popery, who could not get on upon his Horse; at length, having prayed to the *Haly-rude of Crail* to help him on, he went to some advantage, and did cast himself over the Horse, and then he blamed *Haly-rude of Crail*, because it could not do, except it did over-do.

I wish his stile were as solid and temperate as that Speech of Mr. *Hutchesons*, which though he flightingly calls an *Harangue* yet was such as did well become a Minister of the Gospel; whereas this Author by a flood of great swelling words, is often carryed away beyond all bounds of Rime or Reason; but although they who cannot discern betwixt Words and Reason, may be tossed to and fro with the windy noise of empty words; yet they who can discern the forcibleness of right words and solid arguings, from bold and imperious dictates and captious Questions, will not be moved with a Mass of words, void of the Nerves of solid Reason.

After his Questions, he very earnestly desires the Indulged Ministers to relinquish the Congregations where they have the peaceable exercise of their Ministry. To this Petition I give this short answer: These Ministers think it their duty to preach in these Congregations, and therefore till he prove it to be their duty to relinquish them, he cannot expect that they should grant his Petition. The reading of the following History which he recommends, hath been so far from shaking them, that they are more confirmed thereby; for his grounds are either so false, or so inconcludent of what he would infer from them against the Indulged Ministers, that any who understand any thing of the rules of right reasoning, are confirmed that the cause he hath taken in hand is evil; for if there had been good reasons to have concluded against the Practice of the Indulged Ministers, a man of his parts, and who had so much spare time to seek them out, could hardly have missed them.

After this Petition and Advice to read the History, he saith, *I am not without hope, but you will suffer your selves to be overcome into a compliance with the humble and earnest beseechings, not of your poor Brother only, but of many who are presenting you to God, and dare seek nothing for you till this be obtained; do not offend at this last word, for if it were my last, I must both confess unto you, I never had confidence to seek any thing for you, since you embraced the Indulgence, save this; and I know since that day, you have been out of the Prayers of many serious Prayers, to whom you were and yet*

yet are dear, which hath been none of your advantage; yea, whatever use you may make of it, yet fidelity to you, put me to use this freedom; that I have not only found myself in fetters, but I have observed more fervent, judicious and gracious persons, to whom it was a case of Conscience; yea, who had no confidence to represent you to God, as a part of that suffering remnant for whom they assayed to pour out their heart before him; whereat you will cease to wonder when you consider, that to them the Indulgence was defection.

Ans. If his Petition prevail not to draw the Indulged Ministers to relinquish what they have embraced; he essays to drive them from these Congregations where they exercise their Ministry, by a new kind of Excommunication; for till this, which he desires be obtained, he shews that himself and others dare seek nothing for them; if he had said, that in their Prayers for the Indulged, they did in the first place seek, that they might relinquish what they had embraced, and then subjoyned other Petitions to that, it had been hard enough to have justified this Method and Order of praying, as the only right Method of praying for them; but that they dare seek nothing for them till they first relinquish what they have embraced, till his Petition to them be obtained, is a new piece of practical Divinity. I am sure the Lords Prayer is not his Directory in this new Method of Praying, or rather of this new Method of restraining Prayer; is there no way of hallowing of the Name of God, and promoting of the coming of the Kingdom of God, and doing the

the will of God which they are bound to by the command of God, till his Petition to them be obtained? I think he will not say that their continuance in these charges, do make void the obligation of the command of God; and if they be obliged to other duties (suppose this granting of his Petition to be a duty which it is not) even before this which he desires be performed by them, why may he not pray for Grace to them, to enable them to hallow the name of God, and do his will in these duties? May he not pray for daily bread for them, and that their sins may be forgiven them, and that they be not led into temptation? &c. May not a godly man dye without any doubt of the lawfulness of his exercising his Ministry in his own Parish, or in any other destitute Congregation that invited him? May not a godly man dye in one, yea, in many errors that are not fundamental? Would this Author, if he were at the death of such, refuse to seek any thing for them, till they explicitly repent of these errors, and actually quit them? I say explicitly; for every good man who hath true Repentance doth virtually and interpretatively repent of every one of his sins.

This Author will have an actual relinquishing what they have embraced, before he seek any thing for them. Our Saviour prayed, that *the Father would forgive those who were persecuting him to death, and mocking him when on the Cross.* Stephen prays, That *the Lord would not lay the sin of those who were stoning him, to their charge.* These Persecutors were far from Repentance and Reform-

ma-

mation, when these prayers were put up for them.

The Author acknowledges the Indulged to be godly men, and so he cannot deny that Christ intercedes for them in Heaven; doth he think that the Intercession of Christ for them is interrupted, till that be obtained which the Author petitions? He knows that Christ intercedes for the Elect before they believe; for he prays for them who shall believe, that they may be one, &c. *Joh. 17. 20, 21.* If their unbelief doth not hinder his Intercession, (for by his Death and Intercession they are brought to believe) doth he think that their miscarriages after their Conversion, doth interrupt his Intercession, and that he intercedes for nothing for them, till they actually reform what is wrong? I would desire the Author and these persons who take this method in this restraining Prayer, to think seriously how they can clear this method of theirs from a discord and discrepancy with Christs Intercession; and if he hath not fallen into that fault, which he without just ground alledged against the Indulged Ministers, What warrant he and these he speaks of, have to cast the Indulged Ministers out of their Prayers, he and they would do well to examine; this is a new sort of Excommunication, to cast those whom he acknowledges to be godly men, out of this part of the Communion of Saints. And I perceive by what he says, that this new censure is no warrantable censure; and proceeds not from that Authority which is given for edification, and not for destruction; for even the
sen.

sentence of excommunication, is for the good
 and advantage, for the Salvation of the person
 excommunicated. But this new censure hath
 been, as he says, none of the advantage of the
 Indulged Ministers. A censure that hath no o-
 ther effect but a non-advantage and damage of
 godly persons; is no censure approved of Christ;
 for he hath commanded his servants and people,
 that they do all their things in love and for edi-
 fication. How the Indulged Ministers can be
 still dear to those who cast them out of their
 Prayers to their damage, I cannot understand:
 I suppose when he and those who take his Me-
 thod, have seriously reflected upon the matter,
 they will find that they themselves have more
 disadvantage by this uncharitable neglect of duty,
 than the Indulged Ministers have. He saith, he
 finds himself in fetters as to praying for them;
 ignorance, and prejudice, and humour, and such
 like distempers, will fetter folk in duty; I am
 sure his fetters are not made of the cords of
 love. I am very confident that more light and
 more love would loose these fetters. If those ser-
 vant, judicious, gracious persons that he speaks
 of, were more judicious, and had more of the
 grace of charity, and had learned to love more
 fervently, they would not have fallen into that
 ignorant and uncharitable case of Conscience,
 which binds them up from making Conscience
 of praying for those who are (as he says) dear
 unto them. If they had more judgment, and
 more fervent charity, they would pray much
 more better than they do; and when they pray
 better

better, the Indulged Ministers will not be cast out of their Prayers. And I cannot but tell him, so long as he and they take such unwarrantable and uncharitable methods of praying Christians, who are truly judicious, will not think so much of their Prayers, as it seems he and they do, who would terrifie the Indulged Ministers by their forbearing to pray for them, from the exercise of their Ministry in those Congregations, in which through the good Providence of God, they have had in a sad time the peaceable exercise thereof.

That these people do not account the Indulged Ministers a part of the suffering remnant, is another of their mistakes; for though their sufferings have not run in the channel of the sufferings of others, yet they have had their large share in sufferings, if the scourge of Tongues and Calumnies, back-bitings and heart-breaking reproaches be sufferings, they may be reckoned among sufferers. These and many other sad things they have endured with much patience; and these things they have suffered, because they could not in Conscience neglect to take the opportunity of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry.

It's another of their mistakes, that they look on the Indulged Ministers as guilty of defection. They might have had patience till the Ministry of the Church of *Scotland* had tried and found the practice of the Indulged Ministers defection: But at their own hand to condemn so many judicious and conscientious Ministers of defection, and cast them out of their Prayers, are

are among the wild Practises of this evil time; in which many folk do what is right in their own eyes.

But I perceive a new sort of negative Religion is like to come in fashion in this Generation: Practical Divines condemn the ill-grounded confidence of those who please themselves because they forbear gross evils, though they neglect that which is good; and justly, because *the tree that brings not forth good fruit, is hewen down and cast into the fire.* But now many please themselves as if they were more judicious, gracious, tender than others, because they forbear to hear the word of God preached by those whom they dare not to deny to be Ministers of the Gospel, and because they forsake the assemblies of the Lords People met together for the Lords worship; and because they do not pray for those who are dear to them, and whom they dare not deny to be godly, until they actually do that which they desire them. O what need have we to walk humbly, and pray earnestly for the Spirit of a sound mind!

He saith in that same page, *That God hath written an History against the Indulged Ministers acceptance.* I wish he had forbore this rash assertion; the right order had been to have shewed that the practice of the Indulged Ministers was contrary to the written word of God; he knows that Providence is not our Bible. I know not what History this is, and what these effects that he speaks of, as flowing from the Indulged Ministers practice which he mentions elsewhere, are,
H and

and so cannot speak particularly to them; if he meant that some have been very busie to draw people away from hearing the Indulged Ministers, he may remember that there were some who endeavoured to draw away the people from hearing Christ himself. *He is mad*, said they, *why hear ye him?* If he mean that some people who once countenanced their Ministry, have withdrawn from them, he knows that many of Christs Disciples went back and walked no more with him; and they who would once have pulled out their eyes, and given them to *Paul*, looked on him as an enemy, because he told them the truth; many have stumbled at Christ and the Gospel, and the Ministers of it, without cause. If he mean the renting and division, that is no effect of the practice of the Indulged Ministers, but of those who did set themselves to draw the people off from them, and upon such grounds that too many people are become very indifferent and careless of hearing any Ministers, and some are only for hearing some few; and how long they will continue their respect for such, who can tell? for it

Mr. Rutherford used to say, that Providence was not our Bible: and Mr.

Ro. Blare used to call the Arguments which the English usurpers took from success, Turkish Arguments.

the work of a spirit of Schism to divide and subdivide, till all be broken in shivers, and crumbled away to nothing. We should be very tender in speaking of Gods written Histories against or for any thing. There are great mysteries in divine Providence, which does not appear, at first, till the Lords work be com-

pleat

pleat, and all his Counsel appear ; and therefore folk who are hasty in determining in this matter, run a great hazard of taking the Name of God in vain.

In his next page he expresses some hope, that amongst the Indulged themselves, among so many godly men, there were some that the Lord should make use of to discover the evil of this Indulgence ; and says, That that man shall be blessed.

Ans. As for the evil that is in the complex of the Indulgence, several of the Indulged Ministers have discovered it to much better purpose than the Author of the following History hath done ; but these same Ministers have given such solid Reasons for the warrantableness of their own Practice in what they have done upon the Magistrates Indulgence, that he cannot in reason expect that they should condemn themselves in that, in which they have so much peace upon so solid grounds.

In his last Section, he says, *Many will cry out against the following History (who shall never be able to answer its Reason, but by clamour) as unanswerable.* I answer, If he had been pleased to have read what the Indulged Ministers and others have written in answer to what the Author of this History sent before this History, in Letters and Questions, he might have seen any thing that this Author hath said against the practise of the Indulged Ministers, very rationally and solidly answered. As for his first reason, for the reasonableness of this, I answer, The evil which

is in the Magistrates actings, which relate to the Indulgence, have been more solidly discovered than this Author doth ; but this Authors great design, is to fasten all the Magistrates faults in this matter, upon the Indulged Ministers : And if this last be the Testimony which the Author means in his second Reason, it's a false Testimony, and of no value and worth, and worse than nothing.

In his third he is mistaken ; for several who are dissatisfied with the Indulgence, are much more dissatisfied with this History , as a Book which they think will do much mischief among ignorant and profane people, in hardning them in a careless neglect of the Lords Ordinances , and profaning of the Sabbath, and jumble many weak and well-meaning people, and confound them with things that they do not understand.

His fourth Reason for the seasonableness of it, is, because the Indulged Brethren had been threatening and boasting with a Vindication of the lawfulness of their acceptance. I answer, The Author either saw these Vindications, for there were many of them, or not ; If he saw them not, might he not have had patience till he had seen what they had to say for themselves ? it was injustice to condemn men unheard, who were offering a Vindication of their Practice ; but it seemed he had a mind to give them Couper justice : But it may be he thought he could imagine all that they had to say ; but this was rashness, and too much self-confidence ; he should have heard them, before he had answered, seeing he knew they had

had spoken for themselves. If he saw any of these Vindications, as some think he did, why did he not examine them? it may be he found them too hot for his handling: If he had sent this History to the Indulged Ministers privately, that they might have given him a return, this had been fairly done; but to print it and publish it to the World at the very first, was not fair; *non amice factum ab amico.*

His first Reason for the seasonableness of it, is, because the Non-indulged Ministers had done somewhat to strengthen the hands of the Indulged, by giving them new confidence in their course, *in obliquo*, covering all aid carrying towards them, as if they had done nothing amiss, but upon the matter, by a direct Homologatry of the Indulgence; for now silence as to all speaking against this evil, is made the very door and porch through which all entrance to the Ministry must pass; *And therefore (saith he) it's now simply necessary, and more than high time, to discover and detect the blackness of its Defection, when the Church is thus brought in bondage by it.*

Ans. I did not think that the Author, though he be very confident upon small evidence, had so far passed the bounds of modesty, as that he durst in Print have avowed and justified the deed of two young men, who contrary to Presbyterian Principles, did set themselves to counteract the judgment and sentence of the suffering Ministers of the Church of Scotland; for their way did manifestly tend to the subversion of the very foundation of all Government and Order.

It's a strange Reason, that because the Non-indulged Ministers endeavoured to strengthen the hands of the Indulged Ministers, that therefore it was seasonable to put out a Book condemning all together; and what else was this, but for two men living at a distance, to take upon them to condemn the whole Presbyterian Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, and to encourage two unruly youths in their contempt of any remnant of Authority, that that poor remnant had?

What sober person, who hath any Judgment in matters of that nature, can but commend the Practice of these Non-indulged Ministers, who laboured to prevent the breaking of the Church, by that Question about the Indulgence, by restraining these young men, who made it their great work to cry out against the Indulged Ministers and the hearing of them? and yet this Author is so far from having that reverence that he ought to have had to the Judgment of the generality of the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, that he thinks, because they agreed together to endeavour to prevent the renting of the Church, therefore it was seasonable to cast in a new fire-ball of Contention among the people, and so render all their endeavours of Unity ineffectual; and what more effectual way would he have taken to render all the suffering Ministers of the Church of *Scotland* contemptible in the eyes of all who will believe him, than to charge all the Indulged Ministers with so black and fearful a defection, and all the rest of the

Mini-

Ministers with a direct homologating of the Indulgence? In this he hath done service very acceptable to Prelatists, Papists, and Quakers, though I believe he designed no such thing.

His sixth, taken from the severe insulting over some of the poor remnant, who could not forbear to witness their abhorrency of it, flows from misinformation; the insulting was among some of those who quarrelled with the Indulged Ministers, and who took occasion from the Indulged Ministers forbearance to meddle with that matter in their Sermons, to say, that they had nothing to say for themselves; and thus their silence for peace sake, was turned into a prejudice against them. They who live in these parts where Indulged Ministers are, can bear witness how much forbearance and tenderneſs hath been used towards the poor people, who were confounded with these doubtful Disputations, and frightened with unknown words of Homologations and Homologatings, and imposed upon by strong allegencies, and parables, and allegories, without Scripture or solid Reasons.

This way of witnessing, which he means the withdrawing from the Lords Ordinances, to which they formerly resorted, and in the use of which they profited, is a way of witnessing, that if they who take it, have little cause to be ashamed of it, as he says, I am sure they have as little cause to glory in it; for there needs no more to qualifie folk for giving this Testimony, but laziness and gross profanity, and contempt of Ordinances. There can be no great matter in that,

which any profane man, as he is profane, and because he is profane, can do.

As for his seventh, neither this Author, nor he, hath proven that the Indulged Ministers entring into these Parishes, was a coming in, not by the door, but a climbing up another way.

His last consists of hopes, That some of these godly men Indulged, may be by this History taken off, and that the Non-indulged will consider how to deliver the Church from this evil, and their Brethren out of the snare, and themselves from giving this evil any interpretative countenance; withal, that they will henceforth appear more friendly towards the real Lovers of them and the Cause.

It's needless to make any Answer to this: but that I see no appearance that this History is like to take any of the Indulged Ministers off; upon the contrary, there are so many false aspersions and uncharitable wrestlings, and so much bitterness, that it makes even indifferent persons suspect his Cause bad, which is managed by so ill means and methods. As for those lovers of the Non-indulged, and the Cause whom he designs, holders fast of their integrity, in whom he seems afterwards to grant that there are excesses, he means, I suppose the young man of whom he spoke before, and if there be any other of his way.

I like well of friendliness, and of shewing of all meekness to all men; but those whom he seems to mean, have given no great evidence, that they are lovers of the cause, if by the cause he mean

mean Presbytery ; for their way was directly destructive to the way of Presbyterian Government; for they would not, and thought they should not be subject to the Ministers, and their work was to kindle the fire of Contention: if he and the Author of the History had had as much charity for the Indulged Ministers, as they had for those young men, they would have found other names for their supposed faults, than blak defection, and betraying of the cause, &c. When all that he says of these young men, is, that they had excesses which are incident to the Zeal of the best Saints out of Heaven. He requires a just discountenancing of the defection of the Indulged Ministers; but he says, these young men ought to be countenanced, cherished and encouraged for their uprightness; and after real affection, and tenderness witnessed to them, then to procede to curb or cure their excesses. Curbing, it seems, seemed too rash a word; and therefore he mollifies it by the alternative of curing. And yet I cannot understand how he comes to condescend to the cure of their excesses; for if I be not misinformed, he and the Author of the History, Commended them for these Practises, which were looked upon as their greatest excesses. But now I remember that one

of them had some strange Enthusiastical Doctrine; it may be he hath heard some such things which he designs excesses. I have been much longer detained in reviewing this

As for example, a confident asserting an immediate Call from God to preach upon a particular Text in a particular place, before any Invitation from the People or Minister.

Epistle

Epistle to the Reader than I designed ; for I really designed to have made my Observation upon it no longer, if not shorter than the Epistle. I did not set my self to seek out all that might have been excepted against, but only took notice of those things which were obvious, and offered themselves at first view.

I thought my self the more obliged to note those obvious errors which I found in it, both for the peoples sake ; some whereof I hear read this book on the Lords day instead of the Bible ; and for the Authors sake, that he, if he shall see what is written, may see himself to be fallible ; and that he may be better advised before he put such Papers as this to the Press ; and that he may know his own measure, and not look on himself as one fit to censure the generality of the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, and to obtrude his dictates upon them, when one of the unworthiest of these Ministers, who hath so little leisure for such work, hath in a hasty glancing through his Epistle, observed in a few pages so many dangerous Errata's in Doctrine, Worship, and Christian Practice, and in Civil and Ecclesiastical Government.

I come now to the History of the Indulgence. I have not so much leisure as the Author of it had, and therefore I purpose not to follow him foot for foot ; as that would be tedious, so it would be needless ; seeing the Author serves us not only twice, but thrice with the same Colloquies.

Occidit

Occidit miseros crambe repetita magistros.

I looked for a state of the Question, but in vain. The true state of the Question, according to the mind of the Author of the Epistle, and the Author of the History, is, *Whether any Indulgence or Permission, though it were for every Minister to return to his own charge, if granted by the present Magistrate, could be made use of?* Both these Authors are for the negative: We heard the Author of the Epistle's mind before; the Author of the History goes the same way, *Pag. 121. 5. If it should be free of all these intanglements, and grounds of scrupling; I leave it to Christian Prudence to consider, whether, as matters now stand, the Lord be not rather calling them to preach his Name on the Mountains, seeing this way hath been so signally blessed of the Lord, and is daily more countenanced of him, than their labouring in their particular respective charges usually have been: And seeing it's undeniable, that the Adversaries are not yet really repenting of their opposition to the Work of God, and therefore, that any such permission, if granted, could not be supposed to flow from any love to the prosperous progress of the Gospel, but rather from the contrary, as is clear in the Indulgence already granted; and to flow from a purpose to entangle and ensnare, yea, and endanger both soul and body; if not from a purpose and design to destroy all at once. He hath a hint of it also, pag. 18, knowing that favours granted by standing and stated enemies, could not be*

be for advantage, but for hurt. *Ans.* I think it was well done, that he left the matter to Christian Prudence; but it was not to the purpose he designs, for seeing it was necessity that put prudent Ministers and Christians to the fields and mountains, because they were there most free from hazard; I suppose the Christian Prudence of the one and other, would advise not to go to the fields and mountains, if the Magistrate granted so free a permission as he there supposes. And I know not if Ministers and people could expect the Lords approbation and blessing, if needlessly they would clash with the Magistrate in going to the mountains; for if Fathers should not provoke their Children to wrath, then certainly Children and Subjects should not provoke their Parents and Rulers to wrath. His suspending of use-making of a liberty granted by the Magistrate, though free of entanglements, and ground of scruple upon the Magistrates real Repentance, and love to the prosperous progress of the Gospel, is as unreasonable as the Author of the Epistle his suspending of his Prayers for the Indulged Ministers till they quit their charges; and it favours strongly of that error, That Dominion is founded in grace. May we take no favours from Magistrates, except they be real penitents, and have gracious Principles and good designs in their Magistratical actings? From what is said, it appears, that though the Indulgence had been free of clogs, yet these Authors would not have been for making use of it; they would still have called the people to leave the Kirks,

Kirks, and come to the fields and mountains. They know that the Magistrate would oppose these Field-meetings; so that people may see, if they will follow the dictates of their Authors, what ever favours our present Magistrates would give, and how free soever of such clogs and entanglements as attended the Indulgence: yet they must go to the fields; and then seeing the Magistrate will send soldiers to dissipate these Field-meetings, they must resolve, if they cannot flee, to be carried to Prisons, or else to fight. This gratifies the designs of Papists exceedingly, who have been labouring ever since the Reformation, to put Magistrates and Subjects in a state-hostility and enmity one against another.

Among many sad things which have accompanied and followed this way, this hath been one, that the conceit many have entertained of fighting, hath exceedingly hindred their Humiliation under the mighty hand of God, and so hath holden on, and encreased the Calamities and Desolations of this poor Church.

From what is observed out of the Writings of these Authors, Ministers and People may see that no Indulgence given by the present Magistrates, will satisfie them; and that it is not a withdrawing from hearing the Indulged Ministers that will satisfie them. Nothing less will satisfie them, than a going to the mountains, and hearing those who preach contrary to the Magistrates command; for there must be a contrariety in their acting to the Magistrate, or else

it is not right; for this is put in the state of the Question in his Vindication of those who scruple to hear and own the Indulged, *Pag.* 128, 129. for those who are to be heard, are such as preach not according to mans order, but contrary thereto. If there be not a contrariety to, and counteracting of the Magistrate, their Authors will not be satisfied, and no wonder; for nothing less than this will answer their design: so that people may see that their Authors, though they were out of danger themselves, being at a good distance, and under an Engagement by subscription with their hand not to come where the hazard was, yet they take upon them to draw up poor people, as it were in *Battalia* against Rulers, and armed rude soldiers, and discharges them to hear any Proposals from the Magistrate, or to make any to him, or seek or receive any thing from him; and now I leave it to be considered what this tends to. It was not becoming them, especially who were without the reach of Musket-shot, to be so prodigal of the lives of poor people, as to think of no way of Peace, nor of any treating. I could not but remember what I had read in *Terence* of *Toraso*, who kept himself far off from the hazard, and put others betwixt him and it; but he undertakes to give the sign of Battel, *Hic ego ero post principia inde omnibus signum dabo.* And of *Gnathos* remark, *Illuc est sapere ut hos instruxit ipse sibi cavet loco:* But People should not upon the desire of any man, rush themselves upon hazards; when crosses lies in the way that God calls them

them to walk in, then they are their crosses which the Lord calls them to take up willingly, and bear patiently; but they must not go out of the Lords way to seek crosses; they will meet with as many as the Lord sees meet for them in the Lords way. I cannot see how the prescriptions that their Authors give to people, consists with that command of of God, *Rom. 12. 18. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.* I am sure Rulers are not excluded, but in a special manner included in the Universality of all men.

But I do not wonder, that the Author did not form the state of the Question distinctly; nor do I wonder, that they who are against the Indulged Ministers, are generally against distinctions, at least in that Question; seeing that any apparent strength that is in their arguings, is founded in confounding things that differ. If the Question be rightly stated, as I stated it in the beginning, the Arguments commonly used against the Indulgence, will be found not only inconcludent, but very ridiculous; for suppose the acts of the Magistrate indulging, to be wrong; and suppose the Indulged Ministers to have miscarried in their appearance before the Council; yet if ye but grant them to be Ministers of the Gospel, they might warrant to return to preach to their own Parishes, and destitute Congregations, might warrantably invite others of them who had not access to their own Congregations, to help them in their destitute condition; and they might warrantably come upon their invitation to help

help them. To argue, it was unlawful to invite them, and for them to go upon that Invitation, because the Magistrate appointed or permitted them to go, or because the Magistrate gave them Instructions, is very absurd reasoning; for this absurdity follows upon it, that the Magistrate may lay by any, yea, all the Ministers of the Gospel from exercising their Ministry, and render it sinful to them to exercise their Ministry; for according to this way of reasoning, he need do no more to bind up a Minister in his very Conscience, that he cannot preach without sin, but appoint him or permit him to preach, and give him Instructions, and the work is done. He need not give pay to maintain soldiers to hinder preaching, with Swords and Guns, seeing he may do all that soldiers can do, and much more, by Pen, Ink and Paper: for soldiers can only impede them where they are present by external force; but these Paper-Ordinances reach their Consciences, that they cannot preach without sin in any place that he appoints or permits them to preach in.

But there was thus much at least of right in the Magistrates Indulgence, that it did so far relax that general restraint that was formerly laid by Penal Statutes upon Ministers, that whereas before they could preach nowhere without hazard, now they might somewhere have the publick exercise of their Ministry without hazard or disturbance; so that it made way for the peaceable exercise of their Ministry in some places; so that though the former Statutes were not abrogated, yet this derogating from such Statutes,

for this dispensation in taking away the Obligation of the Law, or the Obligation of a part of it, as to some persons in respect of some place, &c. is something of right, and better than nothing, and may lawfully be made use of.

The Method which the Author hath followed, is first to represent the Indulged Ministers as guilty of many grievous faults, and then to draw people from hearing them, to the Mountains. The most compendious way, if I be not mistaken, to meet with any thing he says, is to consider what is in his Arguments against the Indulgence; for he resumes there what he had remarked on the Kings Letter; and what he hath in his Vindication, is taken out of these Arguments. In these Reasons against the Indulgence, he saith, the Reader may see at one view, what was scattered up and down the foregoing Relation; so here we will find all his forces united and drawn up in order.

Pag. 85. i. He promises to shew in how many particulars, *Injury was done by the Indulgence, as accepted, unto our Lord Jesus Christ, the only Head and King of his Church.*

Ans. That which the Indulged Ministers accepted, was a freedom from, or a relaxation of that civil restraint which had hindered the peaceable exercise of their Ministry; as was cleared before. If he alledge that they accepted of the Instructions, &c. This is an acceptance of his own making, and he may make any thing, if he pleases; for the Indulged Ministers cannot hinder any body to fight against their own fancies.

having premised this, I come to the particulars of his charge against them.

1. (Saith he) in that hereby they declared they did not hold their Ministry wholly and solely of Christ Jesus: How proves he this? We, saith he, ^{say} above, how the Indulged did plainly and positively refuse to say, that they held their Ministry of Jesus Christ alone, where *ex professo*, the word alone was left out. See what is remarked on Mr. Hutchesons Speech, and what was said in answer to the Informer, who was dissatisfied with M. Blair, whereby an injury of a very high nature was done unto our Lord Jesus. That which is remarked on Mr. Hutchesons Speech, is in pag. 24. 9. they say, That they received their Ministry from Jesus Christ: But why was it not said, as some of them (if I am not misinformed) desired, only from Jesus Christ, when this was designedly and deliberately left out; let all the World judge whether in this they carried a faithful Ministers of the Gospel or not: For my part, I cannot but judge, that this was a manifest betraying of the Cause, and a giving up of all to the Magistrate; for hereby they declared, that either in their judgment they had their Ministry from others as well as from Christ, that is from the Magistrate as well as from Christ; and that in an equality and Co-ordination, or else that they had it not from Christ immediately, but from men, from the Magistrate in subordination to Christ. And then he reasons against both these, and concludes, that therefore when they kept out the Word only, they did plainly declare that they held their Ministry partly of the Magistrate. And after he hath started

another Objection about holding the peaceable exercise of the Ministry from the Magistrate, he concludes; *So that use what devices men can to cover this matter, a manifest betraying of the Cause will break through, and a receding from received and sworn Principles, will be visible.*

In the answer to the Informer, to which also he refers, he saith pag. 71. *Ministers receiving instructions for regulating them in the exercise of their Ministry from Magistrates, acting like themselves Magisterially and Architectonically, do, if not formally, yet at least virtually, deny Christ to be the only Head and Lawgiver of his Church.* But again pag. 85. he objects, *That this fault was but personal and accidental to the Indulgence, and so cannot effect the same, or make it an encroachment upon Christ of so high a nature.* He answers, *That being spoken at that occasion, when the King and Council were acknowledged thankfully, for granting of the Indulgence, and being spoken with understanding, it must be granted that it had reference to the Indulgence it self, and so (saith he) their discourse was to this purpose in effect.*

We declare that we hold not our Ministry of Christ alone, but of Christ and of the Magistrate; and therefore do accept of this Indulgence without scruple. He adds afterward. Further this Discourse of theirs so worded purposely and deliberately, saith, *That if they had not believed that they held their Ministry not of Christ alone, but of others also, they could not have accepted of the Indulgence.*

*It's worded
of this
Business
not the
words of
this me
the but
of him
not the
History
of the in
Indulgence*

Ans. This is the Authors great Gun with which he thought fit to begin the battel; if this misgive and do no skaith, there is no less reason to fear his lesser Ordnance. It's strange that he should have begun with a piece of Ordnance, which he knows not whether it be fixed or not; he is not sure whether the word *only*, was by some of the Indulged Ministers desired to be added; for when he says it, he casts in this doubtful *Parenthesis*, If I be not misinformed. He got many wrong Informations, and this may be one among the rest.

I do not remember of any such thing; and if he be misinformed, his first Argument hath neither matter nor form. I have heard it alledged that some people, by telling uncertainties, yea, falsehoods, come themselves to believe them, and confidently to add to them. I find something like this in this Author.

1. We see he speaks doubtfully, if I be not misinformed; but the oftener he repeats it, he grows the more positive and confident; for we never hear more of any doubt of his Information; yea, in repeating he wonderfully amplifies the matter, and makes the not saying of this only, to say many things; *For*, saith he, *hereby they declared, that they did not hold their Ministry wholly and solely of Christ.* He might have easily perceived, that a positive Declaration that they did not hold their Ministry from Christ only, is more than a not-saying, that they had it from him only. A man may truly say, I had this gift from my Father, though he add not the exclusive

ve word *only*: Who yet cannot positively declare, that he had not the gift *only* from his Father, because he (as I suppose) received it from his Father, and not from any other.

Again, he granted that some of the Indulged desired that the word *only* might be put in; sure these did not positively and plainly refuse to say, That they held their Ministry from Christ alone; and yet here he charges it upon the Indulged, generally, that they refused to say so. This is another of his Amplifications.

Then he judgeth that this was a manifest betraying of the Cause, and refers it to the judgment of the world, if they carried as faithful Ministers. What? shall Ministers be condemned as not faithful, because they spoke of their Ministry in the words that the Holy Ghost taught Paul to speak, *Acts 20. 24*. Shall the using of the Words of God be judged a betraying of the cause of God? Suppose that that word was designedly and deliberately left out; this might have been the reason that they durst not adventure to add a word to the words of the Apostle who spoke by the Inspiration of God.

He amplifies yet further, *This was*, saith he, *a giving up all to the Magistrate*: That is a wonderful amplification. There is no mention made of the Magistrate in that sentence at all, nor any giving of any thing to him there, but an acknowledgment that they had received their Ministry from Christ; and yet he will conclude, that by this all was given up to the Magistrate. What? was nothing given to Christ from whom they acknowledge-

knowledge they had received their Ministry expressly, and all given to the Magistrate, whom they do not so much as mention there? But he will prove that they gave up all to the Magistrate; For, saith he, *hereby they declared, that in their judgment they had their Ministry from others, as well as from Christ.* Here he eats in again somewhat he had said; for even now all was given to the Magistrate; but here he leaves something at least to Christ, but takes in others with him; but who are these others? *That is,* saith he, *the Magistrate, as well as from Christ.* What? was there no others but the Magistrate that they might have their Ministry from? I think he might rather have supposed that it was the Father and the Holy Ghost, than the Magistrate, especially when he is speaking of an equality; for it was an abominable alledgance of Blasphemy to say, that they declared in their judgment that they had their Ministry from the Magistrate, as well as from Christ, and that in an Equality and Coordination; Or else, saith he, *that they had it not from Christ immediately, but from men; from the Magistrate in subordination to Christ:* But were there no other men beside the Magistrate? if he would have dealt candidly, he might have supposed that I resbyterians meant rather the Presbytery than the Magistrate; and therefore, saith he, *when they kept out the word only, they did plainly declare that they held their Ministry partly of the Magistrate, quod erat demonstrandum.* He is not sure if this word was desired to be put in; he knows not whether it was kept out upon de-

design ; he knows not upon what design it was kept out ; suppose it had been designedly kept out, and how then can he conclude from this , That these Ministers declared, and that they plainly declared that they held their Ministry of the Magistrate? he may conclude any thing he pleases at this rate of reasoning ; yet I perceive he hath forgotten himself, as very ordinarily men who pass the bounds of truth do , except they have very good memories ; for a little before he alledged, all was given up to the Magistrate ; but here he hath reduced him to a part : what is cited from pag. 71. relates to the instructions, which will come in afterwards.

That the want of this *only*, was a personal fault, or was an encroachment upon Christ, or did affect the Indulgence, as he speaks : he must prove he would make it a fault affecting the Indulgence, because it was at that occasion when the King and Council were thankfully acknowledged for the granting of the Indulgence, and because it was spoken with understanding ; but this hath no shew of Reason, if it be considered what it was they thankfully acknowledged, the freeing of them from the restraint which was upon the publick exercise of their Ministry ; any who are not blinded with prejudice, may see that this was the design of these Presbyterian Ministers to shew, that though they acknowledged the Magistrates taking off that restraint, yet they did not look on themselves as the Magistrates Ministers, but as the Ministers of Jesus Christ, who had received their Ministry from him : But the thing

I 4

that

that he says, must be granted, whether there be reason or no; and so he proceeds in his Amplifications; and out of the want of this *only*, he forms a Charrang and Discourse, and puts it in these Ministers mouths; and so if ye will believe him, their Discourse was to this purpose in effect: We declare that we hold not our Ministry of Christ alone, but of Christ and the Magistrate; and therefore do accept of this Indulgence without scruple. But, which is more strange, he will not only have them to say as he says, but also believe as he alledges upom them; he will not only impose Charrangs upon them, but he will impose a Creed upon them; For, saith he, *this Discourse of theirs saith, That if they had not believed that they held their Ministry not of Christ alone, but of others also, they could not have accepted of the Indulgence.* I am sure no judicious person who reads these things, will think that they deserve any refutation; and I am very apprehensive such will alledge, that I had little to do who transcribed them.

When I was writing this, and reflecting upon the wild conceits that the Author hath fallen into upon this supposition, that *only* was purposely kept out, and that his amplifications grow still the more remote from truth; it put me in mind of a censure which an *English* man passed upon a *Scottish* Gentleman with whom he was acquainted; this Gentleman told him strange things which the *English* man could not believe, they were so leasing-like: This *English* man having occasion to speak of this Gentleman, said of him, He

He is, said he, a very pretty Gentleman, but he amplifies mightily. This Author hath amplified mightily upon the word *only*; and if he had been professedly making Romances, it had been more tolerable; but in a matter of so great importance to give his fancy leave to rove so as to condemn a Scripture-expression made use of by the Indulged Ministers, and to draw Treason against Christ, and a betraying of the Cause out of a Scripture sentence uttered by the Apostle *Paul*, speaking by the Inspiration of the Spirit; and not only to condemn them for using the words that the Holy Ghost useth, but to impose words of his own, and a Creed of his own devising upon them; and then condemn them because of that Faith and Profession, is very intollerable insolency.

His Argument, if reduced to a form, must be to this purpose. *Whosoever designedly and deliberately declares that they have received their Ministry from the Lord Jesus, and says not that they have not received their Ministry from Jesus Christ only, they deny Christ to be alone head of his Church, and are guilty of High Treason against the King of kings, and betrayers of the Cause, and they set the Magistrate in Christs Throne, and hold their Ministry of the Magistrate, &c. but so is it, the Indulged have designedly and deliberately declared, &c. and therefore, &c.*

Ans. He is not sure of the truth of the matter, for he brings in the Story, pag. 24. with that doubtful Parenthesis, *if I be not misinformed*; many say, that it was the Authors mishap that he was many times misinformed; and its like this may be a piece

piece of his bad intelligence : it's doubtful if it was refused by any of the Indulged Ministers, to say they received, their Ministry from Christ only. The Author doubts of the truth of it himself, and I do not remember if ever I heard this before.

But again, suppose it was refused, yet it was not refused by all the Indulged Ministers, and yet he charges all indefinitely ; it can be only charged upon the first ten who appeared before the Council, and not upon all these either ; for he says, *some of them desired to have only put in*, and so they did not refuse. Yea, for any thing he hath said, this Refusal, if there were any such thing, might have been only the Act of the Speaker ; and yet from this Omission or Refusal to put in this word, which for any thing he says might have been the deed of one, he charges all the Indulged with High Treason against Christ, yea, he would have been at proving that this Omission did affect the very Indulgence ; and for any thing I can see, he would make this Omission affect all after-Indulgences ; for if the second Indulgence be affected as well as the first, why not also a third, and *sic in infinitum*. He amplifieth mightily when he speaks of any ill or supposed ill in the Indulged Ministers. The Magnifying-glass through which he hath looked upon the faults of the Indulged Ministers, hath not been a true Glass ; and there hath been no charity intermixed in its composition, but the vice which is opposite to that grace, hath been the great Ingredient in its composition.

But

But I come to his major Proposition ; and I shall so far gratifie him, though I be not obliged to it, to give him leave to alledge that this *only* was deliberately left out. Yet I deny his Proposition upon this ground, because if it were true, the Apostle *Paul*, who spoke by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, when he said *he received his Ministry from the Lord Jesus*, would be chargeable with all these hideous things, which he charges on the Indulged Ministers ; for *Paul* put not in this exclusive particle *only* in his assertion, when he was speaking to the same purpose which Mr. *H.* was speaking of ; and he spoke not rashly but with understanding and deliberation, yea, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. If ye say, *Paul* did not refuse to put it in ; that's true, because none did desire him to put it in ; but I enquire, if the Author had been by him, and had desired him to alter what he had spoken, that he might prevent the *Erastian* Error, whether he would have altered what he had said ? I suppose none will be so bold as to imagine he would have altered the words of the Holy Ghost. Who dare take on them to teach God, who made mans mouth, how to speak ? If any were so bold as to alledge, that if *Paul* were to speak this over again in these times, he would add *only* ; he would be as ridiculous as that Minister was, who before the celebration of the Communion, told his Hearers, *That they had hitherto received the Communion sitting, but now they were to receive it kneeling ; it's true*, said he, *Christ gave it sitting, but I am sure if he had given it again, he would have given it kneeling*.

kneeling. What the Spirit of God who knoweth all things past, present, and to come, spoke by the Apostle *Paul*, he spoke it not only for that time, but for this; and except mens eyes be quite put out by prejudice, or some other distemper, they cannot imagine that words dited by the Spirit of Christ, are chargeable with these horrid things which the Author would charge upon the Indulged Ministers, who spoke as the Apostle *Paul* spoke: Might not this be a very good Reason why Mr. *H.* might refuse to put in the word *only*, because he would not mend the Phrase and Stile of the Holy Ghost?

2. But Mr. *H.* might think it fit to forbear to put in the exclusive Particle, to prevent the Calumny of those who might readily have alledged that they pretended to an immediate call, such as the Apostles had; for the words seem to sound that way; and to add any word to the words of the Holy Ghost, which might be turned into an occasion of Calumny, had been, to say no more, great rashness.

3. Mr. *Hutcheson* might have this Reason why he put not in the word *only*, because Ministers receive their Ministry not only from Christ, but also from the Father and the Holy Ghost; and it is one of the Arguments whereby Orthodox Divines prove the Deity of the Holy Ghost, against those Hereticks who deny it, That the Holy Ghost is the Author and Institutor of the Ministry, and cite that same Scripture which the Author hath cited, pag. 85. Hence, saith he, *they are said to be made Overseers by the Holy Ghost*, Acts 20. v. 28. so that

that if he had but considered what he was writing, he might have seen a very good Reason why Mr. H. did keep out the exclusive Particle; and was not this a very good Reason why he might deliberately leave it out, that he might not lose an Argument for the Deity of the Holy Ghost? And *Gal. 1. 1.* The Father is joyned with Christ, *Paul an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead.* And *Acts 13. 2, 4.* he is separated and sent by the Holy Ghost to the work of the Ministry. He might have remembred that Mr. H. was much better insighted in Divinity, than he was, and might have had many Reasons for forbearing this Addition, which he could not fall upon.

4. If he had confessed his Ignorance, that he did not know upon what Reason or upon what Design Mr. H. had left this word out; this might have been spoken ingenuously; but to alledge that the design of this, was, to betray the Cause, and to establish Erastianism, and to set the Magistrate in Christs Throne, or put them in the room of the Presbytery, was a foul fault, which deserves a worse name than I will give it; and this fault is the more inexcusable, because there is not only no ground, nor appearance of ground in Mr. *Hutchens* Speech for it, but on the contrary, any who will not shut their eyes may see that Mr. *Hutchens* design was to shew, that they had not their Ministry from the Magistrate, and that the Magistrate cannot order the Ministry or Ministerial actings as he pleaseth. For 1. the Ministry which Mr. H. speaks of, is that Ministry which

which had, as to it's publick exercise, been under a civil restraint; now I suppose none will imagine that at their Ordination they received their Ministry from the Magistrate; for when they were Ordained, Presbytery was standing, and no body imagined that their Ministry was received from the Magistrate.

2. If the Author, pag. 87. reason right, when he shews that the receiving of the Ministry from the Magistrate, is inconsistent with the receiving of it from Christ, and is a plain dethroning of him. Then the receiving of the Ministry from Christ, is inconsistent with receiving it from the Civil Magistrate; and so when Mr. *H.* asserted that they had received their Ministry from Christ, he excluded the Magistrate from Christs Throne.

3. The receiving or deriving the Ministry from the Magistrate is an *Erastian* conceit, and none of the full Prescriptions of Christ, but contrary thereunto, and therefore was excluded by Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech, which asserts the fulness of Christs Prescriptions for regulating the Ministry.

4. Whereas they declare their Resolution in the discharge of their Ministry, to behave themselves as became faithful Ministers of Christ: They shew that they were not the Magistrates Ministers but Christs; and it had been inconsistent with faithfulness, to have derived their Ministry from the Magistrate, or to have submitted their Ministry which they had from Christ, and which they were to exercise according to the Prescriptions, as

accountable to him, to the will and pleasure of men; this had been a sinful way of pleasing men, inconsistent with faithfulness in the service of Christ, *Gal. 1. 10.*

5. Their declaring of their continuance in their known Judgments, shews that they designed to let the Magistrate know that they were not *Erastians*, and that they minded not to put the Magistrate either in Christs Throne, or in the room of the Presbytery; for all who know Presbyterians know that this is their Judgment, That it's Christ and not the Magistrate that is the Fountain of the Spiritual Power of the Church; and that it is not by the Magistrate but by the Presbytery, that Christ doth convey the Ministerial Function to those who are ordained.

Now is not this strange dealing, to alledge that Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech gives the power of Christ, or the Presbytery, to the Magistrate, when there is not only no ground from Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech for any such alledgance, but many solid grounds demonstrating the contrary? but this lets us see the imperious force of prejudice, which will have things to be as it will, without, yea, contrary to all Reason. After the writing of this, I was informed that this alledgance of the Author concerning the word *only*, is utterly false, as all the Ministers alive who were first Indulged will witness.

In his 2, 3, 4. Sections pag. 86, and 87. he answers an alledgance, *That the Indulged Ministers accepted of the exercise of their Ministry from the Magistrate.*

Ans.

Ans. The Indulged Ministers assert, That they have not only their Office or Authority, but also the exercise of it from Christ and not from the Magistrate; and if he had but considered the Scripture which Mr. H. made use of, he might have clearly seen, that the Ministry *Paul* speaks of, comprehends the whole exercise of it; for he speaks of finishing the Ministry which he had received from the Lord Jesus. For any thing I know, the Author in these Sections, is fighting with his own shadow.

In pag. 87. Sect. 5. he saith, *The accepting of this Indulgence containeth another wrong done to Christ, in that thereby there is an acknowledgment made of the sufficiency of all the Rules, Prescriptions and Instructions granted by him for the ordering of the exercise of the Ministry--for in the Indulgence, Instructions were given—and when the Indulgence was imbraced, as accompanied with these Instructions, the power granting these Instructions was acknowledged--and a granting of a Magisterial Power to Magistrates to make such Rules, &c. is a robbing of Christ of that sole Supream Power which is due to him.*

Ans. If the Author had not Printed Mr. *Hutchersons* Speech, and what the Ministers who were called before the Council for not keeping the 29th. of May, spoke, it might have been thought he had never seen their Speeches.

M. *Hutcherson* declares the fulness of these Prescriptions; and yet this Author would have folk believe that the contrary was acknowledged, that these Rules were not full, but insufficient; he supposes these Rules were received; the contrary

rary whereof was before cleared. It's a miserable task to dispute against a man who begs the Question.

His 6th. Section goes upon the same supposition, that they have taken their Ministry and Instructions from the Magistrate.

Ans. The falshood of both is cleared before. He refers us to what he said in the Vindication of Mr. *Blairs* assertion. *Ans.* If the Author had been as well disposed towards the rest of the Indulged Ministers as he was to Mr. *Blair*, he would have vindicated them also, and not have been their accuser; yea, so great is the force of truth, that it hath extorted a Vindication of them also from him; for he acknowledges that what Mr. *Hutcherson* spoke, was the same upon the matter with what Mr. *Blair* spoke; for speaking of Mr. *Hutchersons* desire to the Council, viz. *That their L. L. would be pleased not to burthen them with impositions in the matter of their Ministry, wherein they were the servants of Christ.* He says, he is apt to think that this desire did import, that he and the rest were unclear to submit unto impositions in the matter of their Ministry, because of their being the Servants of Christ; and then he subjoins that Question, Why were the Brethren so offended with what Mr. *Blair* said? which shews that Mr. *Hutchersons* and Mr. *Blairs* words were to the same purpose. As for another sense of these words of Mr. *Hutchersons*, which in that 69. page he mentions; As he does not think it to be the sense of Mr. *Hutchersons* words, so it is so void of sense, and inconsistent with what he acknowledges

Mr. Hutcheson was ordered to speak in all their names, that I wonder how he could imagine any such sense of Mr. Hutchesons words. And pag. 70. the Author saith, *And what difference I pray, was there upon the matter betwixt Mr. Hutchesons requesting that, they might not be burdened with impositions in the matter of their Ministry, and Mr. Blairs saying he would not receive Instructions from them for regulating him in the exercise of his Ministry?* and the Author cleareth this in the words following in that page. He repeats the same, pag. 73. *That Mr. Hutchesons assertion was the same upon the matter with what Mr. Blair said.* Thus I hope he will not alledge there was not an honest Testimony given against the Instructions, seeing he acknowledges that Mr. Blair gave an honest Testimony, and that Mr. Hutcheson spoke the same upon the matter which Mr. Blair said. Pag. 88. Sect. 7. He will have the indulged Ministers guilty, because the Magistrate determined and appointed the qualifications of Ministers; and the Accepters, says he, *acknowledged that they were so and so qualified, and did sweetly acquiesce in the Magistrates Aristocratical determining of these qualifications.* He refers us to his 3d. remark upon the Kings Letter, which is pag. 7. and 8. *The qualifications are, living peaceably and orderly in the places where they resided.* I shall be far, saith he, from saying, that Ministers should not live peaceably and orderly. But he would have it considered what was the sense of this qualification, by such as did propose it, which he says, *is a negative compliance with a great number of heinous evils,*

evils, and an, &c. at the end of them. He expounds it, that is to say, have been very quiet and silent as to the bearing of faithful witness to the Cause of God—and hath been loath to transgress any of their iniquous Laws, and careful to carry so in all their deportment, as not to displease them in the least. What Son of the Church of Scotland could accept a favour in the bosome of which lay such a Reproach? For this, saith he, was an open declaring that he was one of these peaceable livers—he thinks this was a loud call to vindicate themselves from this aspersions, and to have born witness to the truth of God. And after he says, That the Accepters of the Indulgence, did upon the matter and interpretatively give their assent and approbation to these two things.

1. That the Magistrate as such, hath power to prescribe and specify what are indeed, and what he will have looked on as the only qualification necessarily requisite in Ministers.

And next, That these here specified, are the only qualifications necessarily requisite in Ministers; and consequently, that the Apostles and Primitive Ministers, who neither would, nor could have lived so peaceably in reference to the Heathen Emperors, were not rightly qualified for the Ministry. Add to these, saith he, that hereby they acknowledged themselves to be duly qualified after this manner.

Ans. 1. These qualifications were in none of the acts of Indulgence; they were not intimate to the Ministers, much less were these Ministers interrogate, if they had lived peaceably and orderly: And as for the Kings Letter, I believe many Indulged Ministers never saw it, till the

Author printed it; yea, some who have better intelligence than the Author had, doubt if ever any Presbyterians saw the Kings Letter, or a true Copy of it, or if there be a true Copy of it extant; the Council did not publish the Kings Letter; and to quarrel openly at a Clause in the Kings Letter directed to the secret Council, not published to them, and whereof they had no certain Copy upon which they could found their Plea, would have evidenced too great an Itch of quarrelling with the King.

I see it's very hard to please some folk when they are angry; if the Magistrate had designed the Author unpeaceable and disorderly, he would have judged himself injured; and if he had designed him peaceable and orderly, he would have counted it a reproach; and yet it would seem rational, he should have been pleased either with the one or the other. If he look upon it as an injury to be called unpeaceable, why should he think that which is opposite to that injury to be evil? I think he is mistaken in the explication of these terms. I do not well understand a negative compliance; for compliance seems to import something positive; and a negative positive thing, is a thing odly composed.

I know no outed Minister who can fall under the description that he gives of peaceable and orderly living, seeing their very Nonconformity is a transgression of the Laws, and so displeasing to the Makers of these Laws; and to alledge that any of them were silent, as to the bearing faithful witness to the cause of God, &c. is no small injury done

done to them. I suppose it was not the Magistrates design to set down Ministerial qualifications, and to determine that these too, are the qualifications only requisite in a Minister; to alledge that peaceableness and orderliness, which every Magistrate in the world requires of every Subject, were made Ministerial qualifications, and the only Ministerial qualifications by our Rulers, is an alledgance that hath no colour, no shew, no shadow of probability. Nor do I think that it was the design of the Magistrate to exclude Presbyterians for preaching against Prelacy, or for Presbytery, or for the obligation of the Covenant. I do not remember that they have put any to the trouble for Doctrine of that nature. But I conceive their design being to keep the Country peaceable. they had no mind that any Ministers who would stir up the people to fight against them, should be settled in Kirks; and in this they are not singular: For I suppose all the Magistrates in the World are of the same mind. Now he knows that the Apostles and primitive Christians lived peaceably enough in this sense in reference to the Heathen Emperors.

2. But grant that the Magistrate had designed these for Ministerial qualifications, and grant that these qualifications were as ill as he makes them; he hath no shadow of Reason to prove that the Indulged Ministers did approve of the Magistrates taking on him to appoint qualifications, or that they owned themselves to be such and such, as the Magistrate designed; for as I said, these qualifications were not intimate to them; and though they had been intimate, what Mr. H.

spoke was sufficient to cast all qualifications that were not right; for Ministers must be qualified according to Christs prescription; and he summoned up their qualifications in Prudency and Faithfulness. And it's the known Judgment of Presbyterians, that it's the work of Christ, and not of the Magistrate, to institute the Ministry, and to appoint the qualifications of Ministers.

Pag. 88. Sect. 8. He alledges, *That the Indulged are not set over these flocks by the Holy Ghost, but by the King and the Council; and for those who return to their former charges, he says, their ground of returning is not their former relation unto that people, but the Order of the Council.*

Ans. These are false alledgances, and as easily denied by the Indulged Ministers, as affirmed by him. The former relation was the ground of these Ministers returning to their former charges; it was really a just ground of returning; and they who returned, did go upon this ground in returning; the Councils Act did not weaken this ground, but made way for their peaceable access to the exercise of their Ministry, where they had so just ground to exercise it. I wonder how he could obtrude his groundless alledgances, and put his groundless sayings in the mouths of the Indulged Ministers; for he saith, *That the Minister can only now say, Though this be the Flock over which the Holy Ghost did once make me Overseer, yet now I am set over it by the Councils Order.* It's strange that he will not content himself to speak what he pleases without reason, but he will have the Indulged Ministers to speak as he pleases, contrary to their own knowledge and solid reason; but they

they who will speak without reason, must alledge, and make where they want.

He says, *That the cordial invitation, which some possibly did obtain, was no such call as Christs law alloweth; it was not the Rise and Fountain of these Ministers going to these places, but a posterior meer precarious thing; whereby the Ordinance of Christ was rather prostituted than followed. It's sufficiently known, the Council made the free Election, and not the Parish; and withal, where was the Act of the Presbytery, giving them Ministerially a potestative mission. The Council both called, choosed, and sent, and so were both the flocks and Presbytery.*

Ans. He still playeth the Dictator; and what he should prove, he alledgeth, that it is sufficiently known. It's well known that there could be no access to the peaceable exercise of the Ministry without the Magistrate.

2. Ministers could not prescribe to the Council when they should make their Acts of Indulgence; had it been fit for them to have desired the Council to make no Acts inreference to any Ministers, until the Election of the Parish and the Act of the Presbytery had gone before? the Presbyteries were dissolved, and to quarrel that there was no Presbyteries, is but to quarrel against the holy Providence of God, who had deprived us of these Courts; and to have declared that they would not have the Council make any such Act, till Presbyteries were again settled, would have been to have refused any thing from the Council, except they would give all; and this as matters then stood, had been a refusal of any thing

from the Magistrate; this had been very futable to the design of the Author, and the Author of the *Epistle to the Reader*, and *Cup of cold Water*, who are for receiving nothing from the Magistrate. But when it's examined by reason, it will be found to be nothing but unreasonable humor. That the Councils Act which made way for the peaceable exercise of their Ministry in such places, went before the peoples invitation, flowed from the Councils pleasure, which was not in the power of the Indulged Ministers. But after the Council had passed their Act, it was in the power of the Parishes to have invited these Ministers, or not to have invited them, as they saw fit.

— Mr. *Thomas Wylie* hath in that Paper which he emitted for Vindication of the Indulged Ministers, cleared the freedom of the peoples invitation; it was in their power to have invited, or to have forborn to invite; and though they had forborn to invite; they would have been but in the condition they were formerly in. And it was in the power of these Ministers in these bounds, to have consented or not consented to the invitation of the Parishes; and it was in the power of the Indulged Ministers, when they saw the Invitation of the people, to have gone, or not to have gone to these Parishes, as they saw reason; for though the Councils Act made way for their going, yet it did not settle them in these Parishes, nor make any relation betwixt them and these Parishes.

Now when it is considered that all Ministers are Ministers of the Church Universal, and in a special manner of the National Church, in which they

they were ordained Ministers, and many exercise their Ministerial Offices in other Congregations than those where they were ordained (as Presbyterians maintain against Independents) if there be no just Impediment, nor wrong done to any by the exercise of their Ministry ; and that these Congregations who invited them, were destitute, and earnestly desired their help; and that the Ministers of these bounds consented, or acquiesced to the peoples inviting them, and their coming upon the peoples invitation. When these things are considered, I suppose every judicious unperjudiced person, will acknowledge that these Ministers had a sufficient call to help these destitute people, who earnestly desired their help until they might have regrest to their own Congregations where they were ordained Ministers.

He saw that if the call of the Indulged Ministers were questioned, then the call of these who preach in the Fields would be questioned also ; therefore having moved that question, What shall then be said of them, who preach in the Fields? pag. 89. Sect. 3. he answers, *Every one may see how impertinent this question is; for this preaching in the Fields or Houses is no fixed stated oversight over a distinct company, as is that of a Minister over a particular flock, but a meer occasional act, depending upon a providential Call from God, and the cordial intreaty of this persecuted people, which is all that is requisite thereunto. Ans.* This is a piece of art in some Disputers, to flight that as clearly impertinent which they cannot answer; there is no doubt of a difference betwixt fixed and occasional Preaching: for a fixed
stated

stated preaching hath many advantages which an ambulatory & occasional preaching wants; but the question is, whether they who preach in the Fields be called of God to preach, and to take as much inspection as they can for that occasion, of the peoples case to whom they preach; and if their call be good, as I hope he will not deny, the call of the Indulged Ministers must be good also; For the Indulged had a more deliberate Invitation and intreaty than these Preachers ordinarily can have; and a more general invitation from these concerned, than these Preachers have, or can wait for: And the Ministers of the bounds knew of the invitation given to the Indulged Ministers a considerable time before they came; so that if they had been disposed to have excepted against it, they had opportunity to have acquainted the people, or the Indulged Minister, with their exceptions: but these occasional Preachers are often come and gone before Ministers concerned in these bounds hear any thing of it; and therefore, if the one be good, the other cannot be evil.

The fixedness of the Indulged Ministers makes not their call bad. I suppose those people did intreat one of these who preaches in the Fields to stay with them, and take inspection of them as long as he could with safety; would his continuing to labour among them, make his Call, which was at first good, become bad afterwards? if it was good the first time he preached, why should it be ill the next? if he may preach for a month, why not for a year? &c. The term of

a providential Call, is a kittle word; and some have said, That only Providential Ministers are the Ministers that should be heard. We had need to beware of new words in a time when folk are so much addicted to Novelties; ordinarily new words are big with Novelties, new Conceits and new things: how he would define a Providential Call, I know not; but if that be the thing he means, That the Lord in his Providence makes way for, and gives an opportunity of occasional Preaching; then it may be said, that the Lord in his Providence made way by what the Magistrate did, for the peaceable exercise of the Indulged Ministers Ministry in the Congregations where they are settled. I shall say no more of this, but for any thing I can see, if this Author be believed, neither Presbyterians that preach fixedly, nor these who preach occasionally, can say, that their Ministerial oversight or inspection is by the Holy Ghost; for he affirms this of the Indulged, and does not think it requisite in those who preach occasionally; and of how dangerous consequence this is, I leave it to be considered.

Pag. 89. ~~Sec. 9.~~ His 9. Section is concerning the Instructions, of which enough hath been said before. The Indulged Ministers accepted of the relaxation, as before explained, but did not accept of the limitations. In the same page he saith in answer to an objection, *That there could be no simple use-making of that supposed favour, so attended with imposed conditions, without a virtual acknowledgment of a right and power in the Magistrate to make and impose such*

*such conditions ; for howbeit the Council propose the matters by way of command, yet both the nature of the thing, and the Concomitant acts to restrict, &c. say that the accepting of the first is with an engagement to perform the second, both being but one complex thing—*Then he adds ; *That the Council held forth the favour to be granted and accepted condition-ways. And Mr. A. Blair for the rencuncing of the condition, was deprived of the favour ; he who taketh a favour offered with burdens, takes the favour cum onere ; as when a Father grants such a piece of Land to his Son, but withal layeth on the burthen of paying so much debt ; if the Son accepteth the Land, he cannot but take on the debt, though he gave no express consent.*

Ans. That there could be no simple use-making of the freedom from restraint, as before explained, without the acknowledgment that he speaks of, is one of his dictates. The taking off the restraint was good, the laying of restrictions was ill ; are good and ill so inseparable that we cannot chuse what is good, and refuse what is evil?

The nature of the thing says no such thing as he alledges. It's no wonder this Author makes the Indulged Ministers speak his Imaginations, when he makes the nature of things speak any thing that he pleaseth ; then to make all sure, he makes the taking off the restraint, and the imposing of restrictions, to be one complex thing ; for he can make two things, though the one be good, and the other evil, to be one thing ; but this Composition is in his own Phansie. I warrant he can make one thing two: the force of

Ima-

Imagination will do, they say, great feats upon the person in whom the Imagination is: but I hope his Imagination cannot change the nature of things without him, as to turn two things into one, or one thing into two. I am confident the Councillors will not say, That the Instructions, &c. were accepted by the Indulged Ministers; what words might be slipped in Papers, I will not say; and what wonder if some Prelatick person did alledge that, and get it in a Printed paper, when a young man when he should have been preaching, said, *That the Indulged Ministers had given in Bands to the Council.* If Mr. Blair refused the Conditions, so did Mr. Hutcheson; and if Mr. Hutcheson had been imprisoned, his Testimony would have been commended; for this was the difference: for as to what they said, the Author acknowledges that it was the same thing upon the matter; but nothing in Ministers carriage will please some folk, except it anger, and so anger the Magistrate, that the Minister be put to suffer, or else into a posture of War.

His similitude is but a similitude; and although Allegories and Comparisons pass for good proofs among common people, yet he knows that similitudes illustrate a thing, but do not prove it. *may*
A Father who granteth his Son a piece of Land, might have given it to another, and hath power to oblige his Son who gets his Land, to pay his debt; and it's reasonable that a mans debts should be payed by him who gets his Land; but if the Father should grant his Land to his Son,
and

and enjoyn something to his Son that he could not oblige his Son to do, as being something that the Father had not power to prescribe, or something not right, or which the Son could not in conscience observe; if the Son should accept of the Fathers grant, and withal tell him that he could not receive such Prescriptions, and that his Father could not impose such things upon him, or that he had received full Prescriptions from one Superior both to his Father and him, which he behoved to keep upon his greatest peril, without adding to them, or diminishing from them; or that in these matters which his Father prescribed, he was not at his own disposal, being servant to another in things of that nature. None could say in that case that the Son was obliged to the Conditions his Father required.

Now the Indulged Ministers did shew that they had received full Prescriptions, &c. and that the Magistrate had not a power formally Ecclesiastical; and that in the matters of their Ministry, they were the Servants of Christ; but enough of this before.

Yea, I suppose in some cases silence will import no consent nor acceptance. Suppose one who hath by strong hand bound a man who ought not to have been bound, and tells him he will loose him, and withal when he is loosing him, he commands him to do something which he hath no power to command, nor can the man in conscience perform; will any say, that because the poor man holds his tongue, that therefore he hath accepted the Condition? I see no reason
for

for this; for as a man is not obliged at all times to profess what he believes, as is clear in that case commonly alledged; If a mad furious man with a drawn Sword in his hand, would cry, Whoever professes himself to believe the Gospel, I will kill him; no Casuist determines that a Christian is to profess his faith in the hearing of that furious man; so a man is not always bound to profess what he will do, or not do; as suppose one who hath unjustly bound a man, comes and looses him to do something which the man that is loosed hath no mind to perform; is he obliged in all cases to tell that he will not do what he commands, when the telling of it will in all appearance provoke the other to keep him still in bonds? He who gets an Estate from one who owed him nothing, and a Command withall to pay his debt, seems to be in justice bound to pay that debt, though he speak not. Again, he who gets a favour from another, which the giver was not bound to give, and withal a desire to do something for his Benefactor, if the thing desired be not prejudicial to the man who received the favour, or if he be as much advantaged by the favour shewed to him, as he can be prejudiced by the doing of that which his Benefactor desired; it seems that he is in point of gratitude bound to do it: But when one who hath done an injury to another in binding him, looses him and commands him to do something lawful, though the man hold his peace, I do not see how he is bound even to that lawful thing; because the man that looses him, is bound to do
him

him that right whom he had wronged before; and besides, is obliged to make reparation for the wrong done: but much less could he be obliged by his silence, or could his silence be interpreted to be a consent to it. But the Indulged Ministers need not this Answer, for they witnessed a good Confession before the Rulers. If he had formed his similitude thus, A Father restrains his Son from some external duty in Religion, which the Son is called to of God, and when he takes off the restraint, takes upon him to give Rules of worshipping God to his Son, which the Lord hath not given; the similitude would have been more to the purpose: And if the Son had accepted of the freedom from the former restraint, and withal, had told his Father he had full Prescriptions from God how to worship, and that the matters of Divine worship are not to be ordered by the will and pleasure of Parents, but by the Will of God; none would imagine that the Son had accepted of these Instructions.

Pag. 90. He undertakes to shew how contrary the acceptance of the Indulgence is to Presbyterian Principles. If he would have disputed against what the Indulged Ministers did, he should have disputed against their use-making of the relaxation of the civil restraint, as was said before. But he still mistakes the question, and plays in the general confused words of accepting of the Indulgence. *Veterator ludit in generalibus.*

He hath wasted much time and Paper in vain,
in

In fighting against an imaginary accepting of the Indulgence, which is a man of straw of his own making, and he may use it as he pleaseth. We have already spoken of the qualifications which he speaks of in his first Section, and are not to weary our selves or the Reader with needless Repetitions.

In that same pag. Sect. 2. He alledgeth, *That the Magistrate did all which belongs to Church Judicatories in conveying Ministerially the Office and Power to persons qualified, and in granting a potestative mission in sending the Indulged to such and such places, and that the Council only clothed them with Authority for that effect.*

An. 1. These are still his own fancies and dictates; for he cannot prove from the words that the Council used, that they did assume any such thing as a Power of potestative mission. In the first Indulgence they appoint Ministers to preach and exercise the other Functions of the Ministry at such and such Kirks, as he relates, pag. 19. In the second Indulgence they appoint the Ministers to repair to such and such Parishes, and to remain therein confined, permitting and allowing them to preach and exercise the other parts of their Ministerial Function in the Parishes to which they are confined.

Now the words of appointing, allowing, permitting to preach, import no potestative mission. The Magistrate may in some cases not only permit, allow, appoint, but compel Ministers to preach; yea, they may place them, which is much more than appointing them to preach:

If any please to read the Book of the *Discipline of the Church of Scotland*, they will find in the first Book of Discipline, in the 4th. head of that Book, concerning Ministers and their lawful Election, and under the title of Admission, and toward the end of that title, these words, *That their Honours (they mean the great Council of Scotland to whom the Book was directed) were bound by their Authority to compel such men as had gifts and graces able to edifie the Church of God, to bestow them where there was greatest necessity. And after — we cannot prescribe unto your Honours, how that ye shall distribute the Ministers and learned men which God hath already sent unto you. And after they say, and therefore of your Honours we require in Gods Name, that by your Authority ye compel all men to whom God hath given any Talent, to perswade by wholesome Doctrine, to bestow the same, if they be called by the Church, to the advancement of Christs Glory. And afterward they desire them to assign unto their chief workmen not only Towns, but Provinces. And in the head of Superintendents, they think it expedient in that necessity, that their Honours by themselves nominate so many as may serve the forewritten Provinces; and that the same Ministers being called in your presence, shall be by you, and such as your Honours pleases to call unto you for consultation in that case, appointed to their Provinces. And in the last Title of that Section, they say, Of one thing we must admonish your Lordships, that in the appointing of the Superintendents, for this present, ye disappoint not your chief Towns, and where Learning is exercised.*

This

This first Book of Discipline was approven by the Assembly met at *Edenburgh* July 30. An. 1562.

And in the second Book of Discipline which was often examined in several Assemblies, and appointed by the Assembly at *Glasgow* April 24. 1581. to be registred among the Acts of the Assembly, and to remain there *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*; and the Copies thereof taken out by every Presbytery, and every Minister was by the Assembly August. 4th. 1590. appointed to subscribe the said Book of Discipline; in the first Chapter of that Book, it's said, *The Civil Power should command the Spiritual to exercise.* And Chap. 10. which is the Office of the Christian Magistrate, it's said, *That it pertains to the Office of the Christian Magistrate to see that the Kirk be not invaded, nor hurt by false Teachers; nor the rooms thereof occupied by dumb Dogs or idle Bellies—and to make Laws and Constitutions agreeable to Gods Word for the Advancement of the Kirk and Polity thereof, without usurping any thing that pertains not to the Civil Sword, but belongs to the Offices that are meerly Ecclesiastical; as is the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, using Ecclesiastick Discipline, and the Spiritual Execution thereof, or any part of the Power of the Spiritual Keys, which our Master gave to the Apostles, and their true Successors.*

And although Kings and Princes that be godly, sometimes by their own Authority when the Kirk is corrupted and all things out of order, place Ministers, and restore the true Service of the Lord, after

the example of some godly Kings of Judah, and divers godly Kings and Emperours, also, in the light of the New Testament; yet where the Ministry of the Kirk is once lawfully instituted, and they that are placed do their Office faithfully, all godly Princes and Magistrates ought to hear and obey their voice, and reverence the Majesty of the Son of God speaking in them.

I shall but subjoyn one other Testimony, which may be instead of many, and that is the Testimony of that man of God, Mr. *Welsh*, who was very tender of Church-priviledges, in his Epistle Dedicatory to King *James*, prefixed to his Book against Mr. *Gilbert Brown* Priest, he says to the King, *Follow these examples, Sir; send Pastors throughout all the Borders of your Kingdom, to teach your Subjects the Law of the Lord, and the Gospel of their Salvation; establish Religion and Justice in all the Cities of your Kingdom; cause the waters of Life to run from the heart of your Kingdom unto the Borders thereof; establish Pastors in all your Kingdom; strengthen them in their Offices, and speak to their hearts.* And afterward in the next page he saith to the King, *I have heard your Majesty gravely protest before God, in two General Assemblies, That it was one of your Majesties greatest desires, and ye were even as it were ambitious of that work, to plant every Parish within your Kingdom with a Pastor, that the Posterity to come might say, That King James the sixth, had done such a notable Work in his days. Confirm your self, Sir, in that purpose, for ye know who hath said, I will honour them that honour me.*

Thus

Thus we see Mr. *Welsh* makes use of the words, *sending and establishing Pastors*, and does not find fault with the Kings using the word of planting Parishes.

Mr. *Welsh* by the Kings sending, doth not mean a potestative Mission; he understood himself better than so: He knew the King could not ordain Ministers; but the Kings sending, is his commanding, his appointing Ministers to go and preach throughout the Kingdom; but if the Council in the Acts of Indulgence, had made use of the word of *sending*, and other words in the Books of Discipline; O what out-crying would some folk have made, seeing they make the simple words of *appointing* and *permitting* to be no less than a potestative Mission; which is a manifest abuse and perverting of Words!

It is well known, that the Papists give Magistrates much less than they should in Church-matters; yea, they make them meer Executioners of Kirkmens Decrees; yea, some of their Writers have not been ashamed to compare Kings and Emperours to beasts in respect of their Kirkmen. Let any read *Prin's* Preface to his Book called a *Quenchcoal*, and he will see in that Preface which was directed to the late King, Pag. 44, 45, 46. he will find that *Becan's* calls the Pope a Shepherd, and Kings and Emperours Dogs of this Shepherd; and *Gasper Siquipius* calls the Bishops the men who are the *Mulietiers*, and *Ass-drivers*, and the Catholicks *Asses*; and the Catholick Kings, *Asses with Bells*; and *Charles* the Great, he says was a far greater

and wiser *As* than these Kings who cast off the Popes yolk. And yet though they make Kings and Emperours meer Servants to the Pope and Bishops, implicitly and blindly to execute their Decrees; yet they grant that the Magistrate may apply the Church-men to the use and exercise of their Office; yea, even the Jesuits who are most addicted to the Pope, grant this, as *Becanus* the Jesuit in his *Manual of Controversies of the Time*, Book 5. Chap. 19. pag. 746. and witnall shews, that this is the common use among them, *& hoc passim apud Catholicos in usu est*. From what hath been cited from the Books of Discipline, we may see that the Church of *Scotland* did not look upon the Magistrates appointing, and much less on their permitting Ministers to preach, as a potestative mission, or as any part of the power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.

The Author of the History of the Indulgence, mentions not, that I remember, what I have cited out of the first Book of Discipline; he only, pag. 116. objects in the 3d. objection what is cited out of the the second Book of Discipline, Chap. 10. concerning Magistrates placing of Ministers, when the Kirk is corrupted, and all things are out of order; and he answers, *That in such times Magistrates may do much more than at other times; yet, saith he, I suppose none for shame can make use of such a Concession now.*

I suspect the Author hath been gravelled and pickt with this Objection; and therefore he would shuffe it off with scorn and disdain: but this is a piece of Art in some to seem to make nothing of

of these objections to which they see they can give no satisfactory answer ; but when any will without passion consider this passage in the second Book of Discipline, they will see that the placing of Ministers implies more than permitting them or appointing them to preach ; for though the Magistrate appoint a Minister to preach in such a Parish, if the Parish do not invite him, or if the Invitation be not satisfactory to the Minister, he may forbear to go to that Parish to preach ; but when a Minister is placed, he is actually settled in a Parish ; and therefore the Book of Discipline allows of the Magistrates doing more than permitting and appointing Ministers to preach.

Again, it appears from this, That the Magistrates permitting or appointing Ministers to preach in a Parish, is not in the Judgment of the Kirk of *Scotland*, contrary to Presbyterian Principles ; for the Authors of the second Book of Discipline, and the General Assembly of *Scotland*, who examined that Book so carefully, and appointed all the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland* to subscribe it, understood what were the Principles of Presbyterian Government, better than this Author did : And these great Seers did see no *abomination of desolation* in Magistrates placing Ministers ; and much less did they, or could they see it in their permitting them or appointing them to preach when the Church is corrupted, and all things out of order ; but why thinks he, that none can for shame make use of that Concession now ? He gives this Reason ; See-

ing, says he, *our Church was constituted and well ordered, and had all her Rights and Priviledges.* But I wonder that he for shame could make use of this answer. If he could have said, Seeing our Church is constituted and well ordered, and hath all her Rights, it had been a pertinent answer, if it had been true; but when he says, *only our Church was constituted and well ordered, and had all her Rights,* he grants that the Church now is not constituted nor ordered, nor hath not her Rights; he clearly yields the cause, and acknowledges that our Church is in such a case, as that is of which the second Book of Discipline speaks. He might have considered that the Readers of his Book would be very senseless if they could not see a difference betwixt what once was, and what now is; but this was good enough to put off simple people who cannot distinguish betwixt what is past, and what is present. But he adds, *When the Magistrates with their own hands have overturned all, shall this Objection be made use of to countenance their after-practises? that were indeed to teach Magistrates a way how to usurp, and take to themselves all Church-power, viz. let them once by Iniquity and Tyranny break the glorious Order of the Church, and bring all into Confusion, and then forsooth, they may warrantably assume to themselves an exercise all Church-power according to their mind.*

Ans. He seems to insinuate, that the second Book of Discipline yields, that the Magistrate may assume all Church-power, which is an insinuation very injurious to the Church of Scotland.

land. In that same page cited from Chap. 10. of the second Book of Discipline, they shew that the Magistrate may not usurp the power of the spiritual Keys.

2. He might have learned from Mr. *Rutherford*, that the Magistratical power which capacitates the Magistrate to do good to the Church, is the same in ill Magistrates, even in a *Nero*, that it is in good Magistrates.

3. The more ill the Magistrate hath done to the Church, he is more bound to repair the wrong he hath done.

4. According to this way of Reasoning, if the Magistrate overturn the Church; he can do no more good to the Church; if the placing of Ministers in the corrupted state of the Church, be commendable in godly Magistrates, why would he hinder Magistrates which have overruined all, to restore all or a part, to do something that is good? or why should that be counted Usurpation in them, which is commended as good service done to the Church, when it is done by godly Emperours and Kings? Is not that the duty of these who have overturned the Order of the Church, to build what they have destroyed? and when they do any thing that way, it should not be despised, but made use of, as far as can be done with a good Conscience?

But the Indulged Ministers need not anxiously enquire (as to the defence of their Practice) what Power the Magistrate hath, or may have in some cases to command Ministers to exercise their Ministry in such or such particular Parishes; for
that

that which they accepted and made use of, was the relaxation from the Civil restraint; and they were called by these Parishes to preach and do their parts of the Ministry there.

What he saith pag 91. Sect. 3. concerning planting and transplanting, and placing Ministers in particular charges, is obviated already. If he would have disputed fairly, he should have kept the terms of the Councils Acts of appointing, allowing, permitting Ministers to preach in such and such places, and not have thrust in his own words of potestative mission, planting and transplanting.

We heard before what words are used in the first Book of Discipline, as nominating, compelling, appointing, assigning. And in the second Book of Discipline, placing Ministers; and Mr. *Welsh* doth not find fault with King *James's* using the word of planting every Parish within his Kingdom; but as was said, the Indulged Ministers needs not have recourse to these defences. Any who considers, that Presbyterial Government was overturned before these Acts of Indulgence, and Prelacy settled by Law, may think strange, that he blames the Council for not consulting Kirk-judicatories. There were no Presbyterial Church-judicatories to consult, and the Prelates did not like the Indulgence; and the consulting them in the matter, would have readily scared Presbyterians from making any use of the Indulgence.

He saith in that same Section, *That it was the Councils deed alone which did constitute all the Indulged*

dulged Ministers in such and such places, and so made up that relation.

Now this is false, and a begging of the question; for they who returned to their own Congregations had a standing relation to these Congregations, and they who had not access to their own, did not, till they had Invitation from the Parishes, to which they went, and the consent of Presbyterian Ministers concerned, conceive themselves obliged to exercise their Ministry among them; far less did they think, that the Councils deed did constitute them Ministers of these Congregations, and make up that relation; for if they had thought so, they would have thought themselves obliged to have gone to these Congregations upon the Councils deed. Concerning the oversight that they have of these Congregations, we spoke before, and must not continually weary the Reader with Repetitions.

He frequently carps at their getting the stipend; I know not whom he would have to get these stipends, seeing he is against the Indulged Ministers getting of them: as for the Councils design of fixing them in other charges than their own, the Indulged Ministers are not Masters of the designs of any persons, but their own; but the design of these Ministers was to return to their own Congregations as soon as they had peaceable access. Nor could the Indulged Ministers hinder the Council to have regard to the consent of the Patrons, but they had no regard to it. He refers us to his second remark on the Kings Letter. I find no new thing in it; he taxes the Indulged

dulged Ministers silence, and alledges that by their silence they interpretatively assented to the usurpation; but they were not silent, as we heard before. But I would enquire as to the point now in hand, to wit, the Council appointing Ministers to preach in such and such places, What he would have had these Ministers to say? Would he have had these who were appointed to return to those Parishes where they were ordained Ministers, to have told the Council they would not go to these Parishes, because they had appointed them to go? Or would he have had these who were appointed to go to other Parishes than their own, to have refused absolutely to go, because they appointed them to go? They did not promise them to go to preach in those Parishes; but it had been rashness and unreasonable rashness to have absolutely refused to go, and to go upon that account; and therefore as they acknowledged not any relation betwixt them and these Parishes upon the Councils Act, and did not oblige themselves before the Council to go to these Parishes; so they did not go until they were invited by these Congregations. To have absolutely refused to preach in these Congregations, before they had heard what was the resolution of these Congregations who were concerned as well as they in that matter, had been a preposterous haste; and they could not have given any rational account to the Council of such a refusal or protestation: for if the Council had inquired, Why will ye not go to preach there? if they had answered according to this Authors mind, they behoved to have

said,

said, Because your L. L. appoints me to go there and preach, and I can preach no where where ye command me to preach; for I must preach contrary to your command; for so he states the matter pag. 129. had not this been humour and no reason? if the Magistrate had been disposed to make themselves sport, they might have said, Then we discharge you to preach in that Congregation which we appointed you to preach in before, and we appoint you to preach any where else; if the Minister concerned would have been ruled by this Authors reason, or humour rather, he would have answered, Then I will preach in that Congregation where ye first appointed me to preach in, and no other place; this had been very ridiculous!

The Magistrate needs not keep soldiers under pay to hinder any of this humour from preaching in any place; for they need do no more, but appoint them to preach in any place, and they may be sure they will not preach there; or if they would have them to preach in any place, they may forbid them to preach there, and they may be sure they will do it; for this cross humour will act contrary to what is commanded.

Pag. 91. Sect. 4. Relates to the Canons; of these we have spoken before. The Indulged Ministers accepting of the relaxation of the rigour of Civil Edicts, hath no necessary connexion with the approving of the Magistrates power to make Ecclesiastical Canons. The Anthon hath said, *That it hath such a connexion*, but he hath never shown what he said; but he says *this will abundantly evince it,*
that

that if they had received the same or like Indulgence at the hands of the Prelates, clogged with the same or like injunctions, this would have been a granting to the Prelate that power to make such injunctions.

Ans. He knows that in the Judgment of the Presbyterians, the power that Magistrates hath from God, and the exercise of that Power, is Gods Ordinance; and the taking off the restraint so often spoken of, was the exercise of the Magistrates lawful Authority. But Presbyterians do not acknowledge Prelacy, nor the exercise of it to be the Ordinance of God. And therefore there is a great difference betwixt the use-making of an Indulgence from the Magistrate, and from the Prelate. But if that were granted, that a Prelate had the same power from God, that the Magistrate hath, to do what the Magistrate did in taking off the restraint; and then suppose the Ministers to have declared themselves in reference to the injunctions, as they did before the Council, they could not have been at all charged with granting any such power of making instructions to the Prelate; but this Scarcrow is good enough to beguile simple people.

I have often observed, that the apparent strength of all that is said against the Indulged Ministers practice, lies in a confused mistaking of the question, and in false alledgances, and halting similitudes and parables.

To what he saith pag. 92. Sect. 5. It's answered, That it is not in the Acts of Indulgence so easie to prove, as to say, That the Magistrate hath assumed the power of exercising real Church-Ceremonies;

tures; but suppose that could be proven, he cannot prove that the Indulged Ministers are any ways accessory to their assuming any such power.

Pag. 92. he saith, *Our third head of Arguments against this Indulgence, is taken from its relation to, affinity with, dependence upon, and Confirmation by that woful Act of Supremacy made by our Parliament 1669.*

He grants several times in that Book, that the Indulged Ministers did not formally and expressly own, acknowledg, acquiesce in, or approve of the Ecclesiastick supremacy, in and by their accepting of the Indulgence; and that he is far from thinking that they had any intention to make way for, approve of, or confirm the said Supremacy, pag. 33. and else-where; but he alledges they are interpretatively guilty. But this is but a mean alledgance; for as the Magistrates Acts of permitting or appointing Ministers to preach, are not Acts flowing from any sinful Supremacy, as hath been cleared from the Books of Discipline; and these were the Acts which were properly the Acts of Indulgence; So much less can the Magistrates Act of relaxing of the restraint, be called an Act of sinful Supremacy; it was a part of right which they were obliged unto, and it was only this relaxation which the Indulged Ministers accepted and made use of, as is clear from Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech; and if he would have said any thing to the purpose, he should have proven that this was an homologating of an *Erastian*, or absolute Supremacy in the Magistrate. But he never attempts this, and he did best never to essay
to

to do that which he knew he could not do: but according to his confused way, he takes the Indulgence for all the Acts of the Magistrate, relating to the Indulgence, and shews what affinity some of these have with the Supremacy; and this he labours in from pag. 25. till pag. 33. but what will he infer from that? shall the Indulged Ministers be guilty of homologating the Supremacy, because the Magistrates Acts have affinity one with another, and relate one to another? How knows he that we would never have seen the Act of Supremacy, if the Indulgence had been utterly refused? this is but his own conjecture, and conjectures made upon mens designs; and Statemens designs are very uncertain.

I was surprized pag. 93. Sect. 2. When I found him abusing the Indulgence, as an illigitimate brood, because it was directly against law; he means the Laws made in favour of the Prelates; for I thought he would have liked it the better, because it was contrary to Law, and such Laws. If he could have said, that the taking the restraint off these Ministers, had been contrary to the Law of God, it would have been more to his purpose; but that he could not say. In his Sect. 3. he speaks as if he minded to perswade the Indulged Ministers to take shelter under the wings of the Act of Supremacy, against the charge of Sedition; but I do not think that ever any Indulged Minister thought of this for a refuge.

His Sect. 4. refers to the two foregoing heads of which we have spoken. His 5th. Sect. contains *Mr. Burnets* Argument, which shews a correspondence

dence betwixt the Act of Supremacy and the complex Acts of Indulgence, but it concludes nothing against the practice of the Indulged Ministers, or what they did upon or after the Indulgence. As for his 6th Sect. it's more likely that that Act was made to salve these he speaks of in his Sect. 1. than to support the Indulgence; but these things are little or nothing to the purpose. To his Sect. 7. That the taking off the restraint, or the giving relaxation from the restraint, did flow from no usurped power in the King and Council; it was the product of that power which every Magistrate hath from God, pag. 94. To his 8th. where he again brings in the Prelates Indulgence, we spoke before. His 9th. about the Prelates Collation, is to the same purpose; he still begs the question when he supposes, that what the Indulged Ministers made use of, flowed from an unlawful power. In his Sect. 10. he hath the fashion of an Argument, but he begs the question; for he takes for granted, what he should have proven. The Indulged Ministers did not submit themselves to be disposed of by an *Episcopalian* or absolute supremacy in the Magistrate. As for the Ministers going after the Magistrates indulgence to such and such Kirks, he himself grants, according to the second Book of Discipline, That the Magistrate who claims no Spiritual Supremacy, may in some cases place Ministers, which is much more than the Council did, who only appointed or permitted them to preach in such and such Kirks, as we cleared before. We did shew also from the first book of Discipline;

That the Magistrate may in some cases appoint and compel Ministers to preach where there is need. He knows also that the Indulged Ministers who were appointed to go to other Congregations than their own, did not upon the Magistrates appointment go, till they were invited by the people; and would not have gone, if they had not been invited; and his alledgance that that they accepted Instructions, Orders, Acts and Constitutions, to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry, is a false alledgance. He says he hath cleared it above; but he hath neither cleared it above or under.

I cleared from his own Confession, that the Indulged Ministers gave an honest Testimony against these Instructions. He grants pag. 95. *That the Indulged Ministers never did, nor will own the Supremacy, but plainly disown it; and says, he speaks not of a positive, explicate, formal, intentional and express homologating; but of a virtual, implicate, material, and elsewhere an interpretative homologating.* He did well to explain Homologating in the beginning of this page, that the people might understand the meaning of this Greek word; but now again in shewing what sort of homologating the Indulged Ministers are guilty of, he hath added so many Latine words, virtual, implicate, material, interpretative, that the people who read this, will be more in the dark than before; for now they have four kittle words, whereas they had but one before; and yet he will have them to believe, that though the Indulged Ministers plainly disown the Supremacy, that yet they are

vir-

Howie's reprint, p. 252.

virtually, implicitly, materially, interpretatively guilty of it ; that's to say, they are guilty of it, but they cannot tell how : and yet upon this interpretative Homologation which they cannot interpret nor understand, they are advised to withdraw from hearing the Indulged Ministers. The case of the poor people is much to be pitied, who are thus made to stumble at they know not what, and made to believe that the Indulged Ministers homologate a sinful Supremacy in the Magistrate ; and that they in hearing the Indulged Ministers, homologate the Supremacy ; and some have gone that length, that the Ministers who preach not against hearing of the Indulged Ministers, are not to be heard ; and upon the same groundless grounds they may give up private Christian fellowship with those who are not against hearing the Indulged Ministers.

I remember a History which I read of one *John of Liege*, who upon the approach of some enemies against that Town, took such a pannick fear, that he fled into the desert of *Ardenna*, and durst not adventure to come out ; for he apprehended that all men that he heard or saw, were those enemies which first frightened him. It hath befallen this Author, and the Author of the Epistle, as it did to him ; they have taken such a fright at the Supremacy, that they apprehend many Acts to be Acts of Supremacy, which others, who are as opposite to *Eraastianism*, and an arbitrary Supremacy as they, know to be Acts of that Authority which the Magistrate hath from God ; and they apprehend many things to have

affinity with the Supremacy, which have none at all; but this way of theirs is so far from being the right way to discern the ill which is in the Supremacy, that upon the contrary, it's the way to commend it, when these Acts which Orthodox and Anti-Eraſtian Divines grant to be Acts of lawful Authority, are alledged to be the Acts of a ſinful Supremacy.

Pag. 95. We have his fourth ground. I need not repeat the true ſtate of the queſtion; he ſhould have proven, if he would have proven any thing againſt the Indulged Miniſters, that their practice was injurious to the people. I know no injury they have done to the people, except that be an injury, that upon their Invitation they came and preached the truth to them. I think they may be forgiven this wrong.

He ſays, *The meer appointment of the civil Magiſtrate, was all the ground of their relation, and the only thing that made them Paſtors to ſuch a people.* This is falſe, and will never be proven.

I told him, the Indulged Miniſters had no regard to the Patron. He objects, that it will be ſaid they obtained the full and unanimous conſent of the people. And he answers 1. *I doubt if this was either univerſally ſought or obtained.*

Anſ. Seeing he charges the Indulged Miniſters as injurious to the people, he ſhould have been clear, that they obtruded themſelves upon the people; and that the people did not conſent to their coming. It ſeems he makes his doubts to be evidences to prove his Brethren guilty of injurious dealing. But he might have known, that no man
who

who hath any common sense, will take the most confident assertions of an accuser, and much less his doubts, for proofs and evidences against the party whom he charges with a fault.

2. As for those who returned to their own Congregations, they had a standing relation founded upon the election of the people, and ordination of the Presbytery; and none can rationally imagine, that their own Congregations did not desire the return of their own Pastors. As for those who went to other Congregations, not having access to their own; I suppose he would not have thought it suitable for them to have sought Invitations to these Parishes. It was not the Custom, nor had it been decent, but very unsuitable and liable to Exceptions, to have sought Invitations; it was all that could be rationally expected from them, to signify to the people concerned, that they could not come to exercise their Ministry among them, except they did consent. Neither had it been fit for the people to have made a formal election of them, seeing they had never heard, nor seen some of them; and seeing these Ministers were not out of hope of obtaining regress to their own Parishes; but all that was necessary, as the case stood, was the peoples consent to their coming and preaching among them; and when they had heard them, both the Ministers and they might consider what was fit for them to do. I shall set down a true Copy of one of these Invitations.

We under Subscribers in the Parish of——being informed by very many Testimonies, to which we owe credit, That it hath pleased the Lord to endue you with great Abilities for preaching the Gospel, and that upon our call you have free access to come and exercise the Ministerial Function among us; have thought it our Duty to give you a very cordial Invitation to come and preach, which we expect may be upon Sunday, the fifteenth of this instant; after which we are not doubtful, but both you and we shall have such mutual satisfaction, that we shall have the Comfort of your Ministry, and you the opportunity of doing service to your Lord and Master, in pursuance of the Commission you have from him, in whom we remain and subscribe, &c.

By this it appears, 1. That the people were informed, that the Minister had signified, That an Invitation from the Parish was necessary for his access to preach to them.

2. Though they express their hopes, that after his preaching among them, both they and he should have mutual satisfaction; yet they do not determine themselves, nor pretend to determine the Minister; so that both they and he were at liberty, as to a mutual settling.

Now when such an Invitation was given by persons having special interest, and not without the knowledge of the people who had place, to have objected if they had any thing to say; and seeing the people upon the Ministers coming to preach, did willingly come and hear, and continued to do so, and to frequent Diets of Catechising, &c.

What

What further could be desired, as matters then stood? the people were willing that these Ministers come to preach; and when they had heard them, they willingly attended upon their Ministry; and that very unanimously, until about the time of the second Indulgence, some made it their work first in private, and then more publickly, to perplex the poor people with scruples. I say, what further could be desired? and as the matter was circumstantiated, it had been unfit to have used any more formalities in the matter, seeing there was a real willingness in the people to attend upon the Ordinances dispensed by these Ministers.

2. He says, *Where this consent was had, it was but a meer blind, and to me a meer prostituting of that Appointment and Order of Christ, rather than any conscientious observation thereof.*

Ans. This is a very high charge against these destitute Congregations; and I doubt not to say, it is a blind accusation to charge a destitute Congregation, because they desired a Minister of the Gospel to preach the Gospel to them, with such an odious crime as the prostituting of the appointment and order of Christ. When he was charging others as injurious to the people, he should not have wronged them himself, as if they minded to deceive themselves or others, to put out their own eyes, or the eyes of others, by a blind, and as if they made not Conscience of observing Christs Order, but had prostituted it. But let us hear his Reason.

For 3. (saith he) *this call of the people ought to be a free Election and Choice; but there was no free Election left unto them; but whether they did consent or not, the person designed by the Council, was to be set over them.*

Ans. I shewed before, That the peoples Invitation was free, and Mr. Thomas Wylie in his paper hath made it very evident there was no force upon the people; they might have invited or not, as they thought fit. There have been many free Invitations, where there hath not been a comparative preferring of one to others; several people have never had thoughts of any but of one to be their Minister; there may be the greatest freedom without a formal choice of one out of many, upon comparing them one with another.

I wonder how he could say, *That whether the people had consented or not, the person designed by the Council was to be set over them.* How knew he that? did he know the secret purposes of those Ministers, that they would obtrude themselves upon the people against their will? or that the Council would make these Ministers preach, and the people hear against their wills? Both the Ministers knew that they would not preach to these people without their consent; and the people knew that these Ministers would not preach to them except they consented; but this Author knew, it seems, more than they all. He had it seems a *scientia media* of his own, by which he knew what the Indulged Ministers would do, upon supposition that the people did not consent. He is a little

little too homely with the Indulged Ministers; for he not only imposes harangues upon them, of his own making, and makes them speak contrary to their own mind; and imposes Creeds upon them of his own making, and makes them to believe what they never thought; but also he takes on him to tell, that they would have done that which they resolved not to have done. This is very strange, that he should make himself not only Master of their mouths, and of their faith, but also of their wills and future actions! But suppose that event which he not only without, but contrary to reason, takes upon him, as if he had been a Prophet to foretel, had fallen, or would have fallen out; yet this could not make the peoples Invitation unlawful, because the lawfulness or unlawfulness of actions is to be measured by their conformity or disconformity to the rule by their constituent causes, and concomitant circumstances, which are in being when the action is performed, and not from future events.

4. (Saith he) *The free election of the people should go before the persons designation to that charge, and become the foundation of his relation to that flock; but here it was posterior to the Councils designation, and was a meer precarious thing, coming ex post facto.*

Ans. The Indulged Ministers had not the disposal of the time of the Councils actings, as was said before; but the peoples Invitation was before these Ministers preaching to these Parishes.

5. *This*

5. *This call (saith he) and election of the people, was not in the least presupposed as any way requisite either in the Kings Letter, or the Councils Nomination and Election.*

Ans. It may be if a Call or Election had been mentioned in any deed of the Magistrates, he would have excepted against it, because according with the Magistrates will; for elsewhere, as we heard, he commends preaching for not being according to mans order, but contrary thereunto, pag. 129. But any may see that the Magistrates not mentioning of the peoples Invitation, cannot vitiate the peoples Invitation.

6. He addeth, *Nor did they make any mention hereof, when before the Council, nor make exception against the Councils order or collation, until this was had.*

Ans. The Councils Election and Collation are words of his own making; he should have used the Councils own words, and not thrust in invidious terms of his own devising.

If they had mentioned the peoples Call before the Council, it might have been he would have alledged, That this was a bringing of the peoples Call under the Cognizance of the Council; and it might have occasioned the Council to enquire after the peoples calls, and to have urged people contrary to their Inclinations, to have given calls; yea, the Councils requiring them to give calls, would have occasioned scruples to some people, and this might have exposed them to suffering; or if they had upon the Magistrates interposing, given Invitations, it might have been

alledged, That they were constrained thereunto. If the Ministers had rejected the Councils Act, till once they had the peoples Call, then this would have either provoked the Magistrate to retract their Act, and give no Indulgence; which is the thing that this Author would have been at; for, if he thinks it a disparagement to the Parishes, that their Act is posterior to the Councils, he was or might be sure the Council would think it a disparagement to have their Act not only posterior to the Parish Act, but also excepted against and casten, till the Parish Act went before; for the Council would have thought it as great a disparagement to their Act to be trailed at the heels of the peoples Act, as he thinks it for the peoples Act to be trailed at the heels of the Councils Acts. This would have brought in a very odious question about precedency betwixt the Council and the Parish. Or if the Council had determined to settle such a Minister in such a Parish, and saw that he would not go without the invitation of the people; this would have put them to urge the Parish, as thinking it a disparagement to have their Act made void by the Parish-refusal. If the Parish had refused to give a reason of their refusal, they would have used them the more hardly. If they had excepted against the Ministers Qualifications, Doctrine, &c. this would have entangled the people to have pursued these matters before the Magistrate as the Judge competent.

These Ministers intending to make use of the Councils Act, in so far as it was some relaxation
of

of the restraint formerly laid on, and as it did make way for the peaceable exercise of their Ministry in some Parishes, and minding to have it free to those Parishes to invite and not to invite them, as they saw fit, and to themselves to go or not to go, as they found it fit; it was very convenient that they should not make mention of the Parishes or their Invitations; for this might have either needlessly irritated the Council, and provoked them to undo what they had done, or else have entangled themselves and the Parishes. They declared before the Council, that they had full prescriptions from Christ to regulate them in their Ministry; and a violent obtruding themselves upon a people without their consent, had been contrary to these Prescriptions, and contrary to the known Judgment of Presbyterians.

7. *Nor (saith he) did they testify their dissatisfaction with, nor protest against the unlawful usurped interest of the Patron, and his necessary pre-requisite consent.*

Ans. The Author would have had such formal Protestations, because they would have marred all Indulgence. I spoke of Protestations before, upon the Epistle to the Reader. The proper season of protesting against Patronages, had been when they were to establish them by Law; and it concerned all the Ministers as well as these Ten who were first indulged, and it would have seemed impertinent enough for them to have protested against the Patrons for consenting to their coming to such Parishes; if a Patron had been holding them out of a Parish they had right to be

in, it had been more pertinent in that case to have protested, than in this. When a Patron had given his consent without the Ministers knowledge, could these Ministers hinder the Patron to consent? or the Council to have regard to his consent? but they declared their adherence to their known Judgments, and consequently that they were not for Patronages.

8. *Did such (saith he) as wanted this unanimous call or consent of the People, give back the Councils warrant as weak and insufficient.*

Ans. In the case supposed it was sufficient not to go; and it had been very inconvenient to have given back the Councils Act as weak; for this had been to set the Council and the Parish at variance, and a temptation to the Council to reinforce their Act, and make it strong, seeing it was brought back to them as weak.

As for his *Dilemma* pag. 96. Sect. 2. It's easily answered, they look on themselves as having a relation to their former charges, and would return if they could have a peaceable access to their Ministry there. Until that be obtained, the exercise of the Ministry is not the worse that it is fixed; for as was said, the fixed exercise of the Ministry hath many advantages, which an unfixed exercise of the Ministry wants. He seems to make unfixed Ministers to be Curates; for, saith he, *if they look not on themselves as fixed Pastors, then are they Curates.*

This is an injurious Inference to the Ministers who have not the fixed exercise of their Ministry. But it may possibly be said, that he calls them
Curates,

Curates, because of the Councils Order, and because the Council can turn them out when they please ; but I do not see how that makes them Curates more than it did under the former supposition of their owning themselves as fixed Ministers ; for whether they look on themselves as fixed or unfixed, the Councils Act is the same, and the Council can as easily turn them out, though they suppose themselves fixed, as they can when they suppose themselves unfixed ; so that this horn of his *Dilemma* hath no force, except it be in that, That unfixed Ministers are Curates, which is a false and injurious assertion.

I see no necessary Connexion betwixt Curates and unfixedness ; for the name of Curate seems to import that they are fixed to a Cure. And I do not remember that ever I heard unfixed Ministers designed Curates; he might have bethought himself, that some Ministers who went to *Holland*, might be tossed betwixt the Horns of this horned Argument ; and if it have any force, they cannot decline the force thereof. For, if they were fixed Pastors of that Congregation in *Holland*, where they ordinarily preached, what becomes of their relation to their former charges ? if they were not fixed, then were they Curates ; the Magistrates in *Holland* could turn them out when they pleased, as well as the Magistrates in *Scotland*. They continued only during the Magistrates pleasure ; and when the Magistrate thought fit to turn them out of that place where they had the publick exercise of their Ministry, they could not stay whether the Magistrate would or not.

not. The Indulged Ministers have often declared their relation to their former charges, and their desire to return to them, if they could have access; and when they began to preach to the people, among whom they labour for the present, they declared they were ordained Ministers of other Congregations: And neither by word nor writ did they engage themselves not to return to their former charges, as they say this Author did; and they did nothing which might obstruct their regress to these charges; their fixed preaching in one Congregation, so long as they have no regress, is no more obstructive to their return, than the preaching of other outed Ministers in many places, is obstructive to their returning to their former charges.

And if the Author had considered what he himself writes afterward, pag. 103. Sect. 8. he would have seen how unequally he deals with the Indulged Ministers.

He says, *In King James's days, several faithful and honest Ministers were banished from their own Churches, and confined in other places of the Land; and seeing no hope of getting the Civil Sentence taken off, were necessitated to accept of a call to serve the Lord in the places where they were confined.* Now he might have seen that this was much more than the Indulged Ministers did. He adds in that same place, *But we never find that they took the charge of such or such a flock, upon the Edit or Act of the Council enjoying them thereto.*

Now we see that the Ministers not only took the charge of other Congregations, but quit
hopes

hopes of returning to their former charges; and yet he acknowledges them faithful and honest Ministers: but if the Indulged Ministers had thus absolutely settled in other Congregations than their own, it would have been judged by this Author, unfaithfulness and dishonesty. What? is it dishonesty in these Ministers, that they have not quit all hope of returning to their former charges? For I see no difference betwixt them and these honest Ministers, but in this, that they hold out longer in hoping a return, than they did. As for what he says in the end of that Section, That these honest Ministers took not the charge of these flocks where they were confined, upon the Edict of the Council enjoining them thereto; it makes no difference: for the Indulged Ministers did not take the charge of the Congregations where they preach, upon the Act of the Council, as is well known to all who will not shut their eyes, and are not blinded with prejudice.

What the Author hath said in these few lines, pag. 103. Sect. 8. overturns a great part of his Book. The Author hath used divers weights, and deals not equally with the Indulged Ministers. If they had lived in King *James's* time, though they had done more than they have done, they might have been honest and faithful men, though they had absolutely taken the charge of other Congregations than those in which they were ordained Ministers.

Pag. 96. We have his fifth ground of dissatisfaction with the Indulgence, and with the accepting thereof. He still mistakes the question. If he
would

would have said any thing against the Indulged Ministers, he should have proven that their Practice had established Erastianism ; but that had been too hard a Task for him, and therefore he did wisely not to undertake it. It cannot be proven that the Magistrate practised Erastianism in relaxing the Civil restraint which hindered the peaceable exercise of their Ministry ; or that they established Erastianism in making use of that relaxation.

In his Sect. 1. he refers the Reader to what he hath said under the first, second and third heads ; and I need not repeat what hath been answered to these heads.

In his 2d. he says, *That hereby the Magistrate is confirmed in that usurpation of being proper judges of Ministers Doctrine, even in the first instance, that is, before any Church Judicatory take cognition thereof, and pass a Judgment thereupon.* And he refers us to his 8th. remark upon the Kings Letter ; the words of the Kings Letter, as he hath related them, are pag. 4. *And upon complaint made and verified of any seditious discourse or expressions in the Pulpit, or elsewhere uttered by any of those Ministers, you are immediately to turn them out, and further punish them according to Law, and the degree of the offence.* His remark is pag. 14. he remarks, *That the Council is to take notice of the Indulged Ministers speeches in the Pulpit.*

Ans. It seems he is not against the Councils taking notice of their seditious speeches elsewhere ; for he passes that which the Council is also to take notice of ; but if there be no fault in

the Councils taking notice of seditious discourses elsewhere, it will be unreasonable to hinder them from taking notice of seditious speeches uttered in the Pulpit; for seditious discourses in the Pulpit, are not the better, but the worse, that they are spoken in the Pulpit; and they are the more dangerous, and may readily be the more infectious, that they are spoken, as if they were the word of God; and so may readily be received by the hearers, who cannot discern the word of God; and there is no sedition more dangerous, than that which pretends to be warranted by the word of God. No sober person will say, That the Pulpit priviledges a Minister to speak sedition; and that the Magistrate may not take notice of seditious discourses, if they be uttered in the Pulpit.

He adds, *By which we see the Council is made the immediate formal Judge of Ministers Doctrine; for under the pretext of seditious Doctrine, they may condemn the most Innocent and Orthodox Truths. No Anti-Erastian Divine will grant this unto the Civil Magistrate; and though it be true, that the Civil Magistrate can only and properly judge of what is truly seditious, and can only civilly punish for such crimes; yet our Divines never granted that the Magistrates might in prima instantia examine and judge of Ministers Doctrine when alleged to be seditious and treasonable.*

Ans. His first inference, that the Council is made the immediate formal Judge of Ministers Doctrine, will be denied till it be better proven than the Author hath proven it; for it only follows,

lows, that the Magistrate is the Judge of seditious speeches and discourses; and this is no absurdity, even in this Authors opinion; for he grants that the Civil Magistrate can only and properly judge of what is truly seditious. *But,* saith he, *under the pretext of seditious Doctrine, they may judge and condemn the most Innocent and Orthodox truths.* I reply, so Church-judicatory under the pretext of error or scandal, may condemn Orthodox truths, and innocent Practises. But I hope he will not deny, that because a Kirk-judicatory, corrupt in all its members, or in the major part of its members may condemn Orthodox Truths, that therefore Church-judicatories are not the competent Judges of Truth and Error; or of what is scandalous, and what not; and if the Errors of Kirk-men does not destroy the Power and Authority which Christ hath given to Ecclesiastical Courts to judge of Doctrine, and to censure Heresie and Scandals; so the Errors of Magistrates, who take innocent Truths for seditious Errors, does not destroy and make void that Authority which God hath given to Magistrates to judge and punish seditious Discourses.

I cannot well see how, according to this Authors opinion, the Magistrate can have access to judge of Sedition, if it be vented in the Pulpit; *For he cannot judge it,* saith he, *in prima instantia.* He will have the Kirk-judicatories Judgment to precede; but again he binds the Kirk-judicatory up, that it cannot judge what is seditious; *For,* saith this Author, *the Civil Magistrate can only*

and properly judge what is truly seditious; and therefore if the Civil Magistrate may not judge of Sedition till the Church hath judged it in *prima instantia*, I see not how they can judge it at all; for if they whom he will have to judge in *prima instantia*, cannot judge of Sedition at all, their *prima instantia* will never be, and the Magistrates *secunda instantia* will never come; for the first instance must be before the second. If the Kirk-judicatory may not judge what is seditious, as he granteth, then it would seem that the Magistrate must judge what is seditious in *prima instantia*, if he judge at all in that matter. And it seems very hard to bind up the Magistrate that he may not judge of seditious Doctrine, or whether Doctrine was seditious or not, till there be a precedent Judgment of the Church; for what if there be no Church-Courts, or none to which the Minister who is accused of seditious speeches, hath clearness to answer? what if the Magistrate think, and, it may be, have reason to think, that the Church-Court is disaffected to the Magistrate, and favours seditious discourses? Suppose the Court be incorrupt and not suspected to the Magistrate; what if the Magistrate think it dangerous to suffer the Minister who preaches seditiously, to preach on till the Ecclesiastick process against him be ended; seeing such processes use to be long, and they be apprehensive, that his seditious Discourses may bring forth very dangerous effects, before the Ecclesiastick Court can (observing their Order and way of proceeding) inflict any Ecclesi-

clesiastical censure upon him ; and they apprehend that the fire of sedition must be quickly suppressed that it do not spread?

I would gladly know what the Author would have a Minister do, when he is cited to appear before the Magistrate for speaking seditious speeches? would he have him refuse to come till the Kirk-judicatories ended their process? But what if the Magistrate will not wait so long? then either the Minister hath uttered speeches really seditious; and in that case the Author grants, That the Magistrate is the only Judge of Sedition. If his speeches have not been seditious, but the words of Truth, then he hath an opportunity not only of vindicating himself of the crime of Sedition, but also of vindicating the truth, and of instructing and edifying the Magistrate; and who knows, but a plain, sober, solid Vindication of the truth, may be blessed of God to discover to the Magistrate his Error, and the Innocency of the Minister accused; and that any injury done to the Minister for preaching the truth of God, would be a fighting against the God of truth. Every Christian should be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness

and fear. And especially *the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth,*

1 Pet. 3. 15.

2 Tim. 2. 24,

25, 26.

and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the Devil, who are taken Captives by him at his will.

Jeremiah is brought before the Princes, and accused for the Doctrine he had taught; he does not refuse to answer to the Accusation, but shews, That his Doctrine was of God; and takes that occasion to exhort all that were hearing him, to amend their doings; and assures them, that if they put him to death, they would bring innocent blood upon themselves; and this Doctrine hath a good effect upon the Princes, *Jer. 26. 10. &c.*

The Apostle *Paul* refuses not to declare what he had taught to the *Roman* Judges; he sought and took all opportunities of preaching the Gospel; he did not submit his Doctrine to their decisive Judgment; for though they had condemned the Truth, he would have still justified it, and would have pitied them as blind; but he was always before all persons ready to preach the Gospel, of which he was not ashamed.

The true strength of the cause of the Ministers of Christ when they are brought before Rulers for preaching of the Truth, doth not consist in some formalities which men use in litigious Pleas, but in the plain declaring of the Truth of God, which is mighty through God, to the pulling down of strong holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth it self against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.

If the Magistrate take upon him to judge of Causes that are meerly Ecclesiastical, the Ministers of Christ do their duty, when they tell the Magistrate, That such causes are to be determined by the Church-Courts, and not by the Magistrate; but Sedition, by the Confession of this Author, is none of these Causes which are meerly Ecclesiastical; for he grants that the Magistrate can only properly judge of what is truly seditious.

The Historian doth not faithfully relate the History of Mr. *Andrew Melvine*; for in *Calderwoods* History, pag. 144. we find that Mr. *Melvine* at his first compearance before the King and Council, declared what he said in his Sermon, without any Protestation. At his second compearance he protests that he spoke nothing in that Sermon tending to the slander or dishonour of the Kings Majesty his Sovereign, any ways; on the contrary he exhorted always all his Highness's Subjects to obedience and reverence of his Majesty; and most earnestly prayed for the preservation and prosperous estate of his Majesty. And after this he humbly protests, that in respect of Gods ordinance, Acts of Parliament and a late Conference betwixt some Lords and Ministers deputed by the King and Kirk, That the Trial might be remitted to the Judge Ordinary, which was the Assembly of the Kirk; then he pleads the priviledge of the University of *St. Andrews*, the Members whereof were to be judged in *prima instantia* by the Rector and his Assessors. And then again he declares what he

had spoken in that Sermon, that he might clear his Innocency, and remove all sinistrous suspitions.

Thus it appears that Mr. *Melvine* answered concerning his Sermon, before he gave in that Protestation. And as to Mr. *David Blakes* declinature, we see pag. 340. of *Calderwoods* Story, That the Commissioners of the General Assembly, declare that their intention in the Declinature, was no ways to diminish, hurt, or prejudice his Majesties Authority by exeeming from the same Judicatory, any matter or cause civil or criminal, committed by whatsoever persons ; and in this Mr. *Guthrie* agreed with them.

In the close of that 8. Section pag. 14. he blames the Indulged Ministers for silence ; and their silence, and not giving a Testimony, was, as he says, *a Declaration that they were willing that all their Doctrine should be immediately and in prima instantia judged and examined by the Council.*

Ans. 1. As this part of the Kings Letter was not intimate to them ; so though it had been intimate, I do not see how they could in reason have protested against it ; is there any Magistrate in the World, who will suffer Ministers to preach seditious discourses , if they can hinder them ? and if for a reason of their Protestation they had said, That by that means all their Doctrine would be brought under the Magistrates Judgment ; the Magistrate might have replied, that by that reason they gave them to understand, that all their Doctrine would be seditious.

2. This

2. This Declaration is much like the Harangue and Creed which he imposed upon the Indulged Ministers in his first head of Arguments. The Indulged Ministers cannot hinder men to make Creeds and Harangues, and Declarations, and then alledge that they are the Creeds and Declarations of the Indulged Ministers. But it's sad, that any man, and especially a Minister, should have unspent his time, to say no worse, in making such forgeries.

3. The Indulged Ministers declared, That they adhered to their known Judgment in Church-Affairs; now the known Judgment of Presbyterians is opposite to this Declaration, which he falsely fathers upon the Indulged Ministers.

Pag. 96. 3. He saith, *Hereby the Magistrate is confirmed in this usurpation, that Ministers may not preach in publick or in private, without Authority and License from the Civil Magistrate*; and refers us to his 12th. Remark, which is pag. 16. what he says there, comes all to this; *That the Magistrate looks upon them who preach without a borrowed Authority from the Magistrate, as seditious; and that this Indulgence in the sense of the Court, was a clothing of the Indulged with Authority to preach; as if all they had from Christ had been null, and altogether insignificant.*

Ans. 1. I am wearied in repeating, that the accepting and use-making of the relaxation of the Civil restraint, did not confirm the Magistrate in any usurpation.

2. I do not think that the Magistrate imagined, that all the power these Ministers had from

from Christ, was null, and insignificant.

3. Suppose they had thought so, the Indulged Ministers were so far from confirming them in that conceit, that they told them that they had received their Ministry from Jesus Christ; but enough of this before.

He adds *Se^ct. 4* *How this was confirmed and yielded to by the Indulged, we saw above in our Examination of Mr. H. Speech before the Council An. 1669 and that Relation of the carriage and Speeches of those who were before the Council Anno 1673.*

Ans. In his Remarks upon Mr. Hutchesons Speech, which begins pag. 22. he says, *That that Discourse was an homologating of the Kings Letter; and this he supposes to be plain and manifest. This is his ordinary, I perceive, to suppose those things manifest which he cannot prove.* 1. *Saith he, We see the Brethren were not ignorant of the Kings Letter, and the Contents thereof.*

Ans. In Mr. Hutchesons Speech before the Council, there was no mention of the Kings Letter, whether either they or he ever saw the true Copy of the Kings Letter, is not certain; but that the King did write a Letter, directing the Council to allow of the preaching of some outed Ministers, was clear from the Councils Acts; and that the King designed this, was clear also from these Acts; and this was the design which these Ministers desired the Council to pursue, of which the Author speaks in his *Se^ct. 2.* As for the Instructions mentioned in *Se^ct. 3.* we have spoken already. And he mentions them again pag. 25. *But what Mr. Hutcheson said of full Prescriptions, did we*

only give their L. L. to understand, that their Instructions given, or to be given by the Council, were not needful to be laid before them; but also that they could not receive any Instructions to regulate them in their Ministry, but Christs, as we cleared before. His 4. That what the Council did in this matter, was by virtue of the Kings Letter, appeared to them from the Councils Acts. In his 5th. he says, It's matter of astonishment to him, how they could acknowledge this for such an Act of favour and clemency; and how they could say, that in this Letter the Kings singular moderation did eminently appear; and then he reckons up several things in this Letter in which such clemency doth not appear.

Ans. Mr. *Hutcheson* did not say, that there was clemency and moderation in all the particulars of the Kings Letter; and if in any part of the Kings Letter clemency appeared, it verifies what Mr. *Hutcheson* said. Morauists define clemency to be a virtue which appeaseth Superiors towards their Subjects, and moderates punishments; or that it is a part of temperance, restraining the appetite of punishing.

Now it cannot be denied, that the King by this Indulgence, did moderate the rigour of the penal Statutes. As for his 6. it's clear from Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech, That they did take the relaxation of the restraint that had been upon the publick exercise from the King and Council; but what great matters he can make of that, I do not understand. For the Kings taking off that restraint, is no more an Act of any unlawful

ful Supremacy, than the Councils taking it off. As for his Sect. 7. I have shewed at length before, that it was the publick Exercise of their Ministry, freed of that long Civil restraint, for which Mr. *Hutcheson* gives thanks, which is the same with the peaceable publick exercise of the Ministry; yea, in this same Section he justifies what Mr. *Hutcheson* spoke, though he had not mentioned any restraint; for while he grants, that it is true, that Magistrates can hinder the peaceable publick exercise, or free publick exercise, he makes the peaceable publick exercise and the free publick exercise to be the same. The inferences that he would draw, *viz.* That these Ministers did by this acknowledgment grant that there ought to be no publick exercise of the Ministry, without liberty granted from the Magistrate; and that they condemned Christ and his Apostles, and other Ministers who preached without that liberty granted by the Magistrate, are Inferences which are forged by the Authors phansie, but do no way follow from Mr. *Hutcheson's* words. He that will conclude, that because they thankfully acknowledged that relaxation of the restraint which rendered their preaching hazardous, that therefore none ought to preach except they were freed of such Civil restraints, concludes without reason. These Ministers preached before the Indulgence, and would preach though the Indulgence were recalled. The Instance of Mr. *Bruce's* sickness through terror of Conscience for promising silence for ten days, would suite better with those who promised not to return to *Scotland*, and consequently not

not to preach in it, than to the Indulged Ministers who never made such Promise. His 8. Sect. is a foul misrepresentation of Mr. *Hutchens* words; for *these Ministers were not thankful for partaking alone*, as he says, *but for partaking so early of that freedom from restraint and they desire that others of their Brethren might share with them in that liberty*. I often wonder how his Conscience could suffer him to write and print such gross and palpably false Reflexions upon his Brethren. He adds, *that they suffered themselves to be divided from their Brethren contrary to their sworn Covenant*. I answer, It seems he hath not minded this Reason when he took the opportunity of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry in *Holland*, when his Brethren in *Scotland* had it not.

Such foolish Reasonings are palpable wrestings of the Covenant, and makes sport to those who are Adversaries to it. Can any imagine, that the Covenant did oblige Ministers not to preach in Kirks? except they preached all in Kirks? or if all were not suffered, then all should quit their Kirks? this would condemn those Nonconformists who were suffered to continue in their charges, when others were thrust out: According to this conceit, if after the Act of *Glasgow*, which ousted so many Ministers; if the Council had made another Act, commanding them all to return to their own charges, except one or two, they had been obliged not to return till those two returned with them. By the same Reason, if a multitude of Covenanters were imprisoned, and they were all freed from Prison except some few, they

they might not come out of Prison till they come out all together; or if some few were set at liberty, they behoved to stay till all the rest were set free. The Covenant obliged the Covenanters to united endeavours in their places and stations, to preserve the good things, and oppose the evils mentioned in the Covenant; and it obliged them not to turn contrary to what they had sworn, nor to turn indifferent and neutral; but it never obliged them to be always in the same Lot and Condition as to prosperity and adversity; that if one were poor, imprisoned, banished, put to death, all the rest should be so too; or that none should take the benefit of deliverance from any distress, except all that were in distress were freed at the same time; this had been an impossible, unnatural, sinful, and ridiculous conceit! And yet I suppose the mistake of some well-meaning people in this point, hath tempted them to go out of the way that they should have walked in, to seek sufferings, because they saw others were suffering. To his 9. concerning the leaving out of the word *only*, I have spoken at length before. His Sect. 10. pag. 25. concerning the Prescriptions, hath been also spoken to oftner than once. He alledgeth, *they received other Prescriptions from the Magistrate*; this is false, as we have cleared at length before. And thus we see that his Examination of Mr. *Hutchesons* Speech, doth not prove that the Indulged Ministers confirmed the Magistrate in this usurpation, that Ministers may not preach in publick or private without Authority and License from the Civil Magistrate. And

as for the Speeches of those who appeared before the Council Anno 1673. we cleared from the Authors own words, That these Ministers gave an honest Testimony against the Instructions.

Pag. 96. Sect. 5. He charges all the Ministers, and himself among the rest, with a virtual cading and yielding to *Erastian* Invasions and usurpations; but he says, *The Indulged Ministers did willingly submit to the Magistrates actual usurpation of Church-power; and by accepting of the Indulgence, did put them in actual possession of what was but notionally, and in the Theory arrogate formerly as to Nonconformists.*

Ans. Seeing he makes all the Ministers guilty of a virtual cading to these Invasions and usurpations, if he deal with them as he doth with the Indulged Ministers upon their virtual homologation of these usurpations, he must justify the people who withdraw from hearing of them; for as we heard before, he doth not charge the Indulged Ministers with an explicate and formal homologating of these usurpations, but only with a virtual homologating of them. Now if all, even himself be guilty of this virtual yeilding, as he grants, I would enquire whom shall the people hear? Is not this the way to scare away the people from hearing all the Nonconformed Ministers? But he will have the Indulged Ministers more guilty; but he knows that *magis & minus non variant speciem*. His Reason is false; or the Indulged Ministers did not submit to any actual usurpation; nor did they by any deed of theirs put the Magistrate in any actu-

actual possession of such an usurpation. He contradicts himself, when he saith, *That these usurpations were only in the Theory and notion, before the Indulgence* ; for the Magistrates altering of the Government of the Church, and setting up another kind of Church-government than was before, and turning out of Ministers, which this Author Interprets to be Deposition ; were not meer Speculations and Notions, but practises too too real and effectual.

And in this same page he saith, *This Erastianism and Supremacy hath acted and outed at it's pleasure.* They are very far out who think the outing of Ministers to be nothing but Notions and Theory. His 6. is but a Repetition of what he said before ; for what the Indulged Ministers did, was no virtual or real acknowledgment of Erastianism.

The Indulged Ministers made use of what was good, and both in word and practice testified against what was evil in the complex Acts of Indulgence. He proposes this exception, That the Indulged did only accept of a License, which when abstracted from its offensive circumstances, is a meer relaxation of the rigour of former Edicts. He answers 1. *If this Indulgence did respect nothing but the persons and estates of Ministers, then it might be looked on as a meer relaxation of the rigidity of former Edicts under which they groaned ; but it's past all denial, that this Indulgence relateth more, yea, and principally unto their Office and Function, and is designed, as is confessed, for the establishment of an usurped power over the Function of*
the

the Ministry ; yea, and includeth an acquiescing and Submission unto Acts made and proposed by such as confessedly act from a principle of usurpation, and that for the better establishment of the same, and confirmation of themselves in the possession thereof ; and therefore the accepting of the Indulgence cannot but contribute to the iniquous ends proposed by the Indulgers.

2. He answers, *Whatever that Licence (as it is called) may be, or may be supposed to be, when abstracted from its offensive circumstances ; yet taken complexly with these circumstances, it must be condemned ; and however in our imaginations we may abstract it from these circumstances, yet we cannot do so in point of practice, seeing it is confessed that the morality of Actions do much at least depend upon circumstances.*

I reply : His first answer distinguishes the Persons and Estates of Ministers from their Office and Function, and distinguisheth an Indulgence respecting their Persons and Estates from an Indulgence respecting their Office and Function ; and he grants that an Indulgence respecting their Persons and Estates, may be looked on as a meer relaxation of the rigidity of former Edicts, but denies that an Indulgence relating to their Office and Function, can be such a relaxation But I would know what reason he can give, why there may not be a meer relaxation of the rigour of Edicts which relate to Ministers Function, as well as of these which relate to their Persons and Estates ? there is very good reason for distinguishing the Persons and Estates of Ministers

O

from

from their Functions, and for distinguishing Indulgences relating to the one, from Indulgences relating to the other. But he hath given no Reason why there may not be a meer relaxation from the rigour of Edicts relating to the one, as well as of Edicts relating to the other. He should not so frequently have imposed on us by his dictates. He might easily have perceived, that this was but a blind and toome talk ; and I think he hath perceived it after he had written it ; and therefore he adds, *That this Indulgence relating to their Function, is designed for the establishment of an usurped Power over the Function of the Ministry.*

I answer : An Indulgence respecting Ministers Persons and Estates, may be designed for an ill end ; and if the Magistrate designed it in the one, he designed it in the other also ; now if the Magistrates wrong design in an Indulgence relating to the Persons and Estates of Ministers, doth not, and should not hinder the Ministers to look upon that Indulgence, and make use of it as a relaxation of the rigour of the Edicts made against their Persons and Estates ; why should his ill intention in granting an Indulgence relating to their Function, hinder them from making use of it, only as it's a relaxation of the rigour of the Edicts which restrained them from the peaceable use of their Ministry ? for the one relaxation considered in its self, is as good, if not better than the other ; for the free undisturbed peaceable exercise of the Ministry, is preferable to the meer freedom of a Ministers Person, or the free use

use of his Estate; And though the Magistrates ill design in relaxing, doth vitiate his Act to himself, yet it doth not vitiate the Act of him that accepts of the relaxation, and disapproves the Magistrates ill design. Although the person who gives Alms out of vain glory, or the Magistrate who gives a Prisoner liberty, out of an ill design, do by their ill designs vitiate their own Acts; yet the indigent mans receiving of the Alms, and the Prisoners accepting of his liberty, are not defiled by the ill design of the Alms-giver, or the Releaser of the Prisoner.

The Author, as it would seem, suspecting what he had said to be but loose-work; therefore to make all sure, he addeth, *That this Indulgence includeth an acquiescing and submission unto Acts, &c.* But it's manifestly false, that they acquiesced or submitted to any Acts that established Erastianism, or any usurpation; but he hath a way of alledging strongly what he should have proven, but could not do it.

That which they accepted, was the relaxation; but he will have them to acquiesce in the Acts, he means the complex Acts of the Indulgence; and so if ye believe him, they could not but contribute to the iniquous ends proposed by the Indulgers. Thus ye see he makes all as sure as his words could make it; for if (without reason) ye will take things upon trust from him, they are as he says, and they cannot but be as he says. Ere I come to his second answer, I cannot but take notice of the Confession in his first Answer.

The Objection which he pretends to answer,

answer, speaks of what the Indulged Ministers accepted; he answers of the Magistrates Acts and their designs in acting; and when he is speaking of the Magistrates Acts, he says, *That this Indulgence includeth an acquiescing and submission, &c.* This must, if it hath any sense, be applied to the Act of the Indulged Ministers; for as the designing of the establishment in the words immediately preceding, relates to the Magistrate; so this submission cannot be the Magistrates Act. This is very confused work! if the Author hath been necessitated to study this Confusion, to wrap up a matter that could not be distinctly handled without disadvantage to his cause, he hath been put upon a pitiful Trade.

His Anf. 2. is as confused as his first. The Magistrates Act indulging, considered morally, must be considered with its circumstances; and he knows that the Indulged Ministers are far from justifying the same. But the Ministers indulged did not accept of those Acts in the complex, but of the relaxation of the restraint; they knew how to chuse what was good, and refuse the evil. But that which hath deceived this Author, hath been a very odd conceit, viz. *That the Indulged Ministers could not in their practice accept of the relaxation, and not be involved in the guilt of the Magistrates design; because the morality of Actions doth much depend upon circumstances; and the end and design is a main circumstance in constituting the morality of an action.* But he was very far out in his morals, if he thought that the morality of one mans action, is constituted by another mans design.

Tunns's

Titius's design is extrinsecal to *Sempronius's* action; another mans bad design, if I do not approve of it, doth not vitiate my action.

I shewed before, that a man may make use of relaxation from Imprisonment, though he who relaxes him hath a bad design in doing it. It's an ill intention in the Agent himself that vitiates his action, and not the ill intention of another person, whose Intention he knows not; or if he knows it to be ill, disapproves it: it's upon the circumstances of our own actions, and not upon the circumstances of other folks actions, that the morality of our actions doth much depend.

Pag. 98. Sect. 7. After the repetition of what he had said often before, he alledgeth, *That the refusing of the Indulgence would have been a sensible defeating of the design of Erastianism, and would have necessitated the designers to have taken other measures.* And he adds, *That this supposable defeat, is sufficient to shew how suitable a medium this was unto the projected end: and that it cannot be said, that this is but accidental; for it hath a necessary connexion with the end, as not only experience hath proven, but the very nature of the thing evinceth, as is abundantly cleared above.*

Ans. The absolute refusal of the relaxation of the restraint; or the absolute refusal of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, would not have been a right way of defeating Erastianism. It's a very ordinary fault in these times, in opposing one evil, to run into another. *Dum vitant stulti vitia in contraria currunt.* There were some, who a little after the Reformation from Popery,

in their opposing the merit of good works, ran into an opposite error, That good works were pernicious to Salvation; this was not a right way of defeating the merit of good works; for this tended rather to harden Papists in their error of the merit of good works, when they saw how absurd this device was, which some had fallen upon to defeat the merit of works. Prodigality is opposite to Covetousness; but it is not Gods way to defeat Covetousness, to turn Prodigal: To refuse the peaceable publick exercise of the Ministry, and to chuse and prefer an unpeaceable exercise of the Ministry unto the peaceable exercise of it; and to chuse a way of preaching upon that account that it's contrary unto the Magistrates will, as if the Magistrates appointment or permission to preach, were inconsistent with Christs call, as the Author states the question, pag. 129. are so far from being right means of defeating *Erastianism*, that they are rather means to harden *Erastians*; for to oppose that power which the Magistrate hath from God, as if that were an *Erastian* power, confirms *Erastians*, that they who oppose *Erastianism* that way oppose the Ordinance of God; And they who refuse to take the peaceable publick exercise of their Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority, but will preach contrary to the Magistrates will, need not to think it strange, if the Magistrate think and say, that such ways and principles as these which lead men to an unnecessary, unpeaceable thwarting with the Magistrate, are opposite to Civil Authority and lawful peace,

and

and so are not of God, who is the God of Order and Peace.

The Indulged Ministers made use of what in the Indulgence was the exercise of that power which the Magistrate hath from God; and by this shew their respect to lawful Authority; and they both by word and practice, did what they judged incumbent to them, to render any evil which was in the complex Acts of the Indulgence, ineffectual. So far were they from doing any thing which had a necessary connexion with any wrong end; and he hath not yet cleared, that experience or the nature of the thing doth evince what he says. I perceive he hath a way of forcing nature, to evince what he cannot prove.

Pag. 98. We have his sixth head of Arguments, in which he undertaketh to shew how prejudicial this Indulgence is unto the good of the Church. If he would have proven any thing against the practice of the Indulged Ministers, he should have shewed that what they did, was prejudicial to the Church. His first Hist. is not pertinent; the practice of the Indulged Ministers in returning to their own charges, or going to Parishes that were destitute, upon the Invitation of the people, as it doth not make any precedent for thrusting out of Ministers; (for he knew that not long before the Indulgence, not only the Indulged Ministers, but others were thrust out) so it makes no precedent for Magistrates putting in Ministers *brevi manu*; for whatever the Magistrate designed, yet these Ministers did not enter in these Congregations *brevi manu*, as was
O 4 cleared

cleared before. And I suppose he will not find in Church-History, that the Church was hurt by the Magistrates restoring or placing Orthodox Ministers. He granted before, that in the corrupt state of the Church, Magistrates might place Ministers. If there be any strength in this first Argument, it will overturn that concession; for if Magistrates may thrust out Hereticks when the Church is corrupted, and place Orthodox Ministers; then he will infer, that the ice being broken, if the Magistrate turn *Arrian*, he will thrust out Orthodox, and put in Hereticks, and the Orthodox Magistrates and Ministers have paved the way and broken the Ice. The absurdities which have followed upon the corruptions of corrupt Magistrates doth no more bind up Magistrates from doing right, than the absurdities which have followed upon the corruptions of Corrupt Ministers doth bind up Ministers from doing their duty.

His 2d. as it is no parallel to the case in hand, so it shews that an ill-disposed Ecclesiastick Court may misplant Kirks; and to reason from prejudices arising upon supposition of mens corruptions, would exclude Ministers as well as Magistrates from having any hand in providing desolate Congregations. The Ministers who were Indulged, did not upon the Indulgence leave their own charges, for they were thrust out of them long before the Indulgence; neither did they go to other Congregations upon the Magistrates sole call, as he supposes; so that he is but fighting with his own shadow.

To

To his 3d. I need say no more but this; if any such emergent fall out in after-times, the carriage of the Indulged Ministers, if it be rightly represented, will not be prejudicial to the Church; if it be misrepresented, as it is by this Author, then he, and not the Indulged Ministers are to be blamed for any ill use that any may make of it; if he had been as tender of the Posterity as he should have been, he would not have so misrepresented the practice of many honest Ministers; for he might have thought, that following generations would lay more weight upon the practice of so many, than upon his Authority; and that his reasonings would be no sufficient Salvo; for Posterity would suppose that so many able and conscientious Ministers wanted not reasonings for their practice; and would readily suspect all his reasonings as not solid.

To his 4th. I answer: The practice of the Indulged Ministers makes no preparative for sending all Orthodox Ministers to one small inconsiderable corner of the Land; for he knows that the Indulged Ministers were not for the unnecessary thrusting in of many Ministers into one Parish. If the Magistrate by force did thrust Orthodox Ministers not only to the High-lands, but out of the Land; I think it were unreasonable to blame the Indulged Ministers, for that Magistrates know well enough the way of confining and banishing Ministers that they would have been quit of many ages ago. Ministers going to *Holland* when they are banished, may have the same consequences that Ministers going to the High-lands may have.

To

To his 3th. I answer: The case of these Ministers who in the second Indulgence were permitted to preach in Congregations which were already provided, was not the same with the case of these who were invited by the people to come and help Congregations which were destitute. And as the Ministers who are not Indulged, contribute for the general good of the Church when they preach as they have access, now in one place and then in another (for they cannot preach to the whole Church at once) so do the Indulged Ministers contribute for the good of the Church when they help these Congregations where they are settled; and their settlement, as was said before, puts them in a better capacity to take inspection of the flock, than if they were not settled; and their preaching in these Congregations does not hinder Ministers who are not Indulged, to preach elsewhere as they have access. The Indulged Ministers did not pretend to be the only doers of the duty of the day, but they did a part of the duty of the day, and they are glad of the success of the Ministry of those who were not Indulged; and wish that it were as great as it is called by him in his Sect. 6. To which I need say no more but these things.

I. That as the Indulged Ministers had no design to deprive the Lords people of the benefit of the Ministry of Ministers not Indulged; so their practice did no way tend to the hinderance of the exercise of their Ministry either in houses or fields, no more than the preaching of one Minister not Indulged in one Parish, did hinder the preaching

preaching of another Minister not Indulged in another Parish.

II. There hath been much more preaching of the Gospel in all places where people were willing to hear, since the Indulgence than before.

III. In all appearance, an utter refusal to have made any use of the Indulgence, would have been a greater obstruction of preaching and hearing, and given greater colour for obstruction than any thing which he alledgeth upon the Indulged Ministers.

As for his 7th. about Stipends, we had enough of that before. It seems he hath laid great stress upon this business of Stipends; for he says, *The hurt and prejudice by this bondage in the matter of Stipends, is inexpressible.* He refers to his 4th. Remark in the Kings Letter, where there are several things cited from Scripture, and the second Book of Discipline, about Stipends, which the Indulged Ministers know as well as he; but what remedy prescribes he? He thinks this was ground enough to have refused the favour. Surely this tale would have told very ill before the Council; We will not preach except we get the Stipend at our own disposal. Again, he speaks as if the Ministers had been in equal terms with the Magistrate, and had had possession of the Stipends, and had alienate them by their consent; whereas the truth was, they were and had been for several years thrust from Kirks and Stipends. I think the Indulged Ministers did much better, and that which was more becoming men of their station, who made no mention of the Stipends at all.

His

His next overture is, he would have had them chusing rather to preach *gratis*, than any way to have contributed to the laying on of such a yoke upon the neck of the Church of *Scotland*; but that yoke was on already; and their refusing to take the Stipend of the Church where they preached, had been to contribute to that sacrifice which is mentioned in the place of the 2d. Book of Discipline which he cites; for thus the whole of the Stipend would have been quit and alienate to another use than that to which it was dedicated. The freedom and faithfulness of conscientious Ministers, will be no more obstructed by receiving what the Magistrates think fit to give, than by receiving what people think fit to give; and they who are not conscientious, will be as much influenced by their dependance upon the people, as upon the Magistrate. Pag. 100. Sect. 8. He says, *The Indulged Ministers became wholly subject to the Council, even in all matters Ecclesiastick, whether concerning Doctrine, Discipline or manners, as being accountable only to them, and wholly at their devotion.* I answer, This is a bundle of untruths, and injurious false aspersions. That the Indulged Ministers cannot get stayed longer than the Magistrate will suffer them, is common to them with all the Ministers of the World where there are Magistrates who have a coercive power, by which they can imprison, banish, &c. He himself and the Author of the Epistle to the Reader, could stay no longer in *Rotterdam* than the Magistrate pleased; as for that coupling from Kirk to Kirk which he speaks of, as if it had been meerly upon the

the Magistrates pleasure, it will I suppose upon trial be found an injurious aspersion ; if a Minister hath upon the Invitation of a vacant congregation, where he might to the greater good of the Church, and with the consent of the Ministers of the bounds, respectively concerned, removed from one Congregation to another ; this will not be found prejudicial, but advantageous to the Church.

As for his Sect. 9. we have often before spoken of the Instructions. After he hath said what he pleases of a base, sinful compacting, which to him is the basest *Symony*, and taking of liberty upon sinful conditions ; He says, *he knows the Indulged Ministers will say they are free of compacting.* And he dare not gainsay ; for he comes off with this faint ; and I shall not accuse them further than I know or have ground ; but he tells us for certain, That the Instructions were in the Kings Letter, and that the Council calls them terms. He knows the Indulged Ministers could not hinder the Kings Secretary, or the Councils Clerks to write what the King or Council thought fit ; but he says, *They who were called before the Council 1673. did not express their dissatisfaction with these terms, so as to quit the benefit, and cast the bargain thereupon.*

Ans. He would, I perceive, have had the Indulged Ministers upon all accusations, quitting the peaceable exercise of their Ministry ; but though they did not think it their duty to do that, yet I wonder how he can say, That they expressed not their dissatisfaction with these Instructions ; for we heard before, that Mr. Blair gave an honest and faithful Testimony against these Instructions, and

and that Mr. H. spoke the same upon the matter which Mr. B. spoke ; this the Author himself saith and proveth : but enough of this before.

His Sect. 10. Supposes that they subjected themselves to the Councils Instructions to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry ; and hence he infers, that they became as formally subject to the Magistrate in matters Ecclesiastick, as any inferior Civil Officers, such as Sheriffs, Justices of Peace, Baylifs. I answer : He supposes what he should prove ; if we yield him his false *postulate*, and give him leave to suppose what he pleases, he may no doubt do great feats, and elect a world of absurdities out of one false conceit ; but though he will readily get many simple ones that believe every word, to believe him, yet I suppose no person that is judicious, will believe so grievous an accusation against so many Ministers of Christ without proof ; if we must not receive an accusation against an Elder, but under two or three Witnesses, much less must we receive an accusation against so many Elders upon the meer word of the Accusers, though they were never so many ; and much less upon the word of one Accuser.

In his Sect. 11. he quarrels with the Indulged Ministers, *because of the want of the free and full exercise of Discipline, and that in the lawful Courts of Christ ; and that they dispence calmly with the want of Church-Discipline in Presbyteries and Synods.*

Ans. 1. As I said before, this is to quarrel against the holy Providence of God.

2. They

2. They wanted these before they were indulged.

3. They may *sub cruce* and *cum periculo* keep Presbyteries and Synods, notwithstanding of the Indulgence.

4. Kirk-Sessions are one of the Courts of Christ, and one is better than none. He excuses the Non-indulged though they have no Discipline, *because all their preaching is sub cruce, not having so much as freedom to exercise any part of their Ministry, and so are allowed of God to do all they can, when they cannot do all they would.*

Ans. 1. The Author hath here forgot himself, and the quarrel he had against Mr. H. for acknowledging the Magistrates granting of the liberty of the publick exercise of the Ministry; as if he had thereby acknowledged, That they had the exercise of their Ministry from the Magistrate; but if Mr. H. had used such words as this Author doth when he speaks of the Non-Indulged, *who, as he says, have not so much as freedom to exercise any part of their Ministry; O what out-crying should we have heard, when he makes such a noise about Mr. H's. words! though he not only adds liberty and freedom, but also publick, to the exercise of the Ministry; and subjoins, after so long a restraint, and under the protection of lawful Authority.*

If Mr. H. had said in the words of this Author, *My Lords, whereas since we were turned out, we had not so much as freedom to exercise any part of our Ministry; but now we have freedom to exercise our Ministry, &c.* What Commentaries and Harangues

rangues would have been made upon and out of these words ! Now if the Non-indulged want the freedom to exercise any part of their Ministry, is it not by the penal Statutes, that they are deprived of this freedom ? were it not an advantage to have this freedom which they want ? and this they cannot have without the Magistrate ; and why may they not accept of this freedom from the Magistrate ? and if they may, what ails the Author at the Indulged Ministers for the accepting of that freedom which they wanted ?

2. He deals not equally with the Indulged and Non-indulged ; *The Non-indulged are*, saith he, *allowed of God to do all they can, seeing they cannot do as they would ;* but he would have the Indulged Ministers do more than they can. He would have the Indulged Ministers keeping Presbyteries and Synods, which they can no more do without hazard, than the Non-indulged ; yea, their hazard would be much greater than the hazard of the Non-indulged ; for the Magistrate would know where to find them if they had a mind to take them ; or if they cited them, they behoved either to appear or to lose the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, which the Non-indulged have not, and so cannot lose. His tacite insinuation that the Indulged are not countenanced in the exercise of Discipline and Preaching, as the Ambassadors of Christ ; and his asserting that they are under the Leesheet of the Supremacy, as if they acknowledged any *Erastian* or absolute Supremacy in the Magistrate in Ecclesiastical matters,

matters, and his reflection on the constitution and guiding of some of their Sessions, are a new addition to his former unproven and ill-grounded alledgances.

As for his 12. the Indulged Ministers *cum periculo*, as well as the Non-indulged, ordain Ministers, they have accepted of no terms to incapacitate them for Ordination. But this would not satisfy this Author, except they did relinquish the Indulgence, and betake themselves to the fields; but we saw before, why nothing but the fields will please this Author.

Pag. 101. We have his 7th. head of Arguments. He alledgeth, *That the Indulged Ministers have stepped off in such a way as cannot but be accounted a falling off from the cause and ground of our sufferings.* We have answered already these Arguments whereby he would prove this alledgance in his first seven Sections. His 8. Section makes much against him, and for the Indulged Ministers, as we saw before. As for his 9th. it's no new thing to see Ministers compearing before the Council; the first Book of Discipline was directed by Ministers to the Council, which was much more than compearance.

He supposes the Indulged to have accepted the instructions; but it's a false supposition, as hath been before cleared. If he will make a parallel case (either in the year 1649. or any year he pleaseth;) the Indulged Ministers are content to leave to all who are fit to judge of matters of this nature, to judge concerning their practice. As for the History which is in his 10. he speaks as if

the Indulged Ministers generally had said, they had not seen these instructions, which is very false. His 11th. He indefinitely charges the Indulged Ministers with laying aside the Lecture, which is another falshood; That any of them who do not Lecture, have forsaken it upon the command of the Council, is another of his groundless alledgances; as some few of the indulged Ministers, so several of the not-indulged do not lecture. But I hope he will not say, That it's the command of the Council, that they forbear it: They have other Reasons; some found themselves not able to lecture and preach twice on the Lords day. His 12th. is resumed in his 8 head of Arguments, pag. 104. where he undertakes to prove, *That the hands of Prelates are strengthened by the Indulgence* The Prelates, I suppose, are not of that mind themselves. First, saith he, *not to mention the open door that is left to them to accept of the Prelates Collation, nor the encouragement they have to seek and obtain.* He did well not to mention this; for it is not worth the mentioning. It's false, That the indulged Ministers put themselves in prison under the Bishops lock and key. As for his second, the Churches where the indulged Ministers are settled, are not encumbered with those who own Prelacy, as they were before the Indulgence, which is no small disadvantage to Prelacy.

It's a false alledgance, That the indulged Ministers were content that their Ministry should be confined within limited places, let the necessity of the Church be what it would or could be;
how

how knows he that the indulged Ministers would not deny to help people that are destitute in other places, if they saw that the necessity of the Church did require it? It would be a prejudice, and no advantage to the Church, needlessly to leave the charges where they are settled, and to leave the Congregations where they are, to be planted with Conformists.

His third Section, in which he alledgeth the friendly and brotherly love and correspondence betwixt some of the indulged and Neighbour-hirelings, and the want of Zeal against Prelates wherever the Indulgence is, is grounded upon misinformation. That Prelates will possibly say, That one Field-Conventicle hath done them and their cause more prejudice than many preachings of all the indulged men, is another of his groundless guessings, and needs no other refutation but this, That possibly they will not say it. *Possibile esse possibile non esse*. It's another of his groundless guessings, That they use more keenness against Field-Preachers than against Prelates. The indulged Ministers, as they have occasion, preach against Erastianism and an absolute Supremacy; and shew from the Scripture, That the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are not committed to the Magistrature; and that all the powers on earth, have no power to dispose or order Ecclesiastical matters at their pleasure; *but that all things in the house of God should be done according to the will of God revealed in the Scripture*.

His 4th. is a begging of the question; he should have proven, That the indulged Ministers have

accepted of any thing which flows from any sinful Supremacy; but that he could not do.

His 5th. supposes that they have accepted of the Instructions, which is a false supposition, and before refuted. The paying of money to the Clerks, in his Parenthesis pag. 106. was not worth the mentioning. These Clerks seek it not by the Prelates Authority, but upon the Councils appointment, backed with charges of horning; and whether it be rather eligible to pay a little money, or to be put to the horn and taken with caption, let any sober person judge. The scruples that the Author and some others have put in the peoples heads about paying of Stipends to the Conformists and Sessors, have wasted some peoples Estates, and tends to waste their Consciences; for when they are quartered on, and eaten up, and plundered, they are driven to do what they thought sinful; and this disposes them to do things that are truly sinful upon temptations; and when they are by necessity driven to pay, they who wait for their halting, alledge they have no Conscience; and if they were put to it in other things, they would do all that would be required of them.

Pag. 106. we have his 9th. head of Arguments, in which he undertakes to prove, That the acceptance of the Indulgence is against our Covenants; but he hath not proven either here or elsewhere, That the Practice of the indulged Ministers, was a breach of Covenant.

The Particulars which he brings to prove this charge, have been all refuted above; and it's need-

needless, and would be tedious to the Reader to repeat the same things. For what he saith page 107. in his fifth Section, of the design of the Indulgers to divide, though it were proven, it would make nothing against the practice of the indulged Ministers; for what they did, did no ways tend to division. They declared themselves before the Council to be of the same Judgment they were of before; and they still preach the same Doctrine, are for the same Worship, Discipline, Government. They are against Popery, Prelacy, Error, Schism, &c. as they were before the Indulgence. The Covenant obliges to continue in adhering to the good things, and opposing the evils mentioned in it; but does not oblige the Covenanters that they shall accept of no favour, or of arighting of any wrong done to them, except they get all the same favour and right done to them at the same time; but I remember I spoke of this before.

Pag. 107. We have his 10th head of Arguments, where he undertakes to prove, *That the indulged Ministers condemn themselves.* His first particular to prove this, is false; the indulged Ministers acceptance of the relaxation of the Civil Restraint, does not condemn either field or house-meetings. In his second he grants, *That all the Indulged Ministers except one, condemn the Supremacy as an usurpation; but,* saith he, *they have accepted that which purely floweth from the Supremacy;* and refers to his third head of Arguments.

Ans. 1. This one whom he excepts, if he had been alive, would have answered for himself; but seeing he is at rest, I am obliged to do him

right, in shewing what was his sense of the Supremacy; and I shall the rather do it, because the Author of the *Cup of cold Water* says, He hath beat his brains to shape a beautiful Mask for the Supremacy, and to put a sufferable sense upon it, and seeks to seat the eyes of others. The Author of the *Cup of cold Water* casts him as no Seer; and not only rejects him from being the man of his Counsel, but directs all the servants and people of God to stand aloof from him, as one who stands not in the Counsel of God; who will seduce, pervert and insnare, whose breath is contagious, and whose speech bewrays him to have the botch of the Court-Creed running upon him. Thus he Stigmatizes, deposes and excommunicates him; *satis pro imperio quisquis es*. It seems the Author of the *Cup of cold Water* hath neither known that Minister, nor yet his opinion concerning the Supremacy, and so he hath ignorantly rushed into a multitude of absurdities. The Minister whom he thus abuses, was a godly, able, painful Minister of the Gospel; and his memory is favoury to those who were acquainted with him; he was well versed in Polemick Divinity, a man who would not be affrighted or boasted with toome empty words. I think I see how he would have smiled at the Author of the *Cup of cold Waters* *Eccho*; alas! it was not *Eccho's*, but *Ergo's* which he regarded; it was not empty sounds, whether direct or reflex, but sound Reason which would have prevailed with him.

As for his singular opinion, it is true, in his answer to the *Countrymans Scruples*, he declares,
That

That he doth not think the Supremacy claimed by the Magistrate, to be a spiritual Supremacy; and gives several Reasons why he conceives it cannot be expounded in that sense; but it's as true, that he is so far from putting a beautiful Mask upon the Supremacy, That he declares this absolute power established in the King and his Successors, to do what they will in Church-affairs, without either Council or Parliament, is and will be matter of astonishment; and that the Act of establishing it, is more dangerous than if it did establish Erastianism or the spiritual Supremacy. And the Reason of this is clear, because although *Erastus* did absurdly imagine, That the Magistrate might himself exercise Ecclesiastical Functions, or imploy others to exercise these Functions in his name; yet he was so far from thinking that the Magistrate might dispose upon, and order things sacred according to his pleasure, that he hath often declared, That he ought to order things sacred according to the prescription of the word of God.

In his answer to *Beza*, pag. 125. of that Edition printed at *Amsterdam* Anno 1649. after he hath ascribed all the Government of the Church to the Magistrate, he adds, *Yet as in taking the care of things profane, it is not lawful to the Magistrate to pass the bounds of Equity, Justice, and Honesty; that is the prescription of the Laws and Statutes of the Commonwealth: so in disposing and ordering things sacred, or things pertaining to the worship of God, it is far less lawful for the Magistrate in any part to depart from the prescription*

P 4

of

of the word of God, which he ought to follow as a rule in all things, and never to decline from it, even in a hairs breadth. Whereas by this Act of Supremacy (saith the Minister who answered the Countrymans Scruples) a King, if he will, may bring in Popery, yea, overturn all Religion, without consent either of Council or Parliament, as we may see in the example of Jeroboam, who caused Israel to sin, by setting up a Worship of his own devising. Is this a beautiful mask, shaped for the Supremacy? the Author of the Cup of cold Water should be ashamed and humbled for these absurdities, that through misinformation he hath run into: is it not strange, that one Minister so ill informed, while he is inveighing against the supremacy, should act as if he had a Papal Supremacy, in stigmatizing, deposing, excommunicating his fellow-servant? But I perceive the truth of that saying, That man will much sooner see a Pope in another mans belly, than when he is in his own. That faithful Minister was seeing light in light, when the Author of the Cup of cold Water did judge him no seer; he was admitted to the fellowship of the Saints in Heaven, before this Sentence of Excommunication was past on earth. He was drinking of the pure river of the water of life, when this foul, and not cold, but scalding hot water was cast at him out of this Cup of cold Water.

The Author hath verified what the Poet thought impossible, *Unda dabit flammas*. I wish the other part of the verse, & *dabit ignis aquas*, may also be verified, that such flashes of fire proceeding from the wrath of man, might be turned

ed into these waters that the Prophet *Jeremiah* wishes for, and be resolved in tears of godly sorrow. Having discovered the wrong which the Author of the *Cup of cold Water*, and the Author of this History have done to that one indulged Minister: I answer, Secondly, That which the Author of the History of the Indulgence subjoins, That the indulged Ministers accepted of that which purely flowed from that Supremacy which they count an usurpation, is false and a begging of the question; as he refers to the 3d. head, I refer to the answer to it before given. His third, *That the entry is founded upon any sinful Supremacy*, is also false. To his 4th. concerning the Patrons, we spoke before. For his 5th. after he hath repeated that the indulged Ministers did receive the Instructions, which is a false alledgance, as we have cleared from Mr. *H's* Speech; and what was spoken by the indulged Ministers who were called before the Council for not keeping the 29th. of *May*, and from the Authors own confession, who grants that they did not obey these injunctions, and acknowledges that they gave an honest Testimony against them; he draws a parallel, whereby he thinks it may distinctly appear, that their refusal of the benefit offered by the accommodation, did condemn their accepting of the benefit offered by the Indulgence; but he is here as far out in his *Mathematicks*, as we have found him before out in his *Morals* and *Logicks*.

The acceptance of the relaxation of the civil restraint, which impeded the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, hath no proportion with, or equality

L equality unto the acceptance of the Proposals made by Bishop *Lighton* for accommodation; for the acceptance of these proposals had been the accepting of a wrong form and model of Church-government. In that Model of Government offered in these Proposals, there is an Officer set up, a *Diocesan* Bishop, who is not in the Rolls of Church-Officers recorded in the Scripture; a President imposed upon, not freely elected by the Synod, not countable to, nor censurable by the Synod, claiming power to restrain not only single Presbyters, but Presbyteries from the exercise of that Authority which they have received from Christ for the Edification of the Church; Who can restrain a Presbytery from ordaining a Minister; though the Church who hath elected him, be most earnest to have him ordained, the person elected be most fit for the charge, and the Presbytery most desirous to ordain. The Synod is mangled in its members, wanting ruling Elders, manacled in its power, not being free to chuse its own Moderator, nor to censure the imposed President, though he were most culpable and unworthy of his place.

The proposals overturns the identity of Bishop and Presbyter; for in them not only is Distinction made betwixt the Bishop and Presbyter, but the Bishop is made Superior to the Presbytery; they destroy the parity of Ministers, and the subjection of the part to the whole: what the Provincial Synod would have been, who could tell? but it's like it would be less than the *Diocesan*; and

and yet this behoved to be subject to that. The accepting of these Proposals, and entering into, and concurring with Meetings thus corruptly constituted, had been a real consenting to owning, settling, establishing, promoting this corrupt constitution of Government; and no verbal declaration of their dissatisfaction with the corruptions in the constitution, could have saved the matter; for their voluntary constituting themselves members of a Court, so corruptly constitute, and concurring with the Bishop while he was exercising his Prelatical Power (for if he exercise it any where, it is in the *Diocesan Synods*) had been contrary to their verbal Declaration; and whatever they said contrary to the Bishops usurpation, or the corrupt constitution of the Court, their deed would have effectively and most effectually established that corrupt form of Church-government, and rendered their words ineffectual and ridiculous.

The most effectual way of establishing an Usurper, is to concur with him in his Courts, and act in a forinick subordination to him. Now the indulged Ministers in accepting the relaxation so often spoken of, did neither verbally, nor really acknowledge, own or establish any usurpation of the Council. The Author says, *That their deed was a manifest compliance with Erastianism*; but this is false, as hath been before cleared; and thus he goeth about to make their acceptance of the relaxation of the Civil restraint, which is in it self a straight line, crooked, that it might run parallel to the crooked line of
com-

compliance with Prelacy ; but this was a fault in morality, whatever it was in the Mathematicks. His first six parallels, and his second six parallels, are nothing to his purpose, except ye let him have his conclusion by begging, in granting that the practice of the indulged Ministers was an establishment of, or a compliance with Erastianism ; Mathematicians uses to demonstrate, and not to beg the question. The Author wanted not will to have made a Demonstration, but the matter would not work for him.

He hath another parallel in the sixth, where he compares the acceptance of the Indulgence with the taking of the Collation ; and first he tells us what the taker of Collation, and the taker of the Indulgence may think ; and then he tells us, what both of them really does. The taker of the Collation acknowledgeth and preferreth the Prelate as a Minister of Christ. So, (says he) *he who submitteth to the Indulgence, acknowledgeth the Magistrate or the Council to be the proper subject of formal Church-power ;* he should have proven that the acceptance of the relaxation, &c. imports any such acknowledgment ; but it was easier to take it for granted, than to prove it.

In his third he tells us, there is in the Indulgence a formal acceptance ; but he tells us not of what ; and, (says he) *a plain submission* ; but he tells us not to what ; and a Recognizance, but he tells not of what ; and a significant transaction, but he tells not about what. It appears by the Parenthesis that follows, *viz.* (if the Council be

be to be believed) that as he durst not before charge the indulged Ministers with a compact, so here he only alledges a transaction; but he is not sure, as his Parenthesis imports.

As for his 4th. he knows that Presbyterians make a great difference betwixt the Magistrate and a Prelate; but of this before. And then it's false, That the indulged Ministers looked upon themselves as Ministers of these Parishes, upon the sole ground of the Magistrates Act. And thus we have done with his parallels, which are meer Paralogisms: If the matter could have afforded better Arguments, the Author would have readily hit upon them; but the subject-matter could not be formed in a Mathematical Demonstration; *ex quo vis ligno non fit Mercurius.*

Pag. 110. we have his eleventh head of Arguments, in which he undertakes to prove, That by the accepting of the Indulgence, the meetings of Gods people are prejudged; he means the meetings nicknamed Conventicles; and he alledges, *That by the accepting of the Indulgence, they have contributed to the suppressing of these Meetings; and that interpretatively they may be charged in part with the severities exercised against the same.* He only pretends to make this probable and likely, and that this head of Arguments deserves some consideration; so that the Arguments under this head, are not in his own opinion Demonstrations, but only topical Arguments.

The Author speaks much more soberly here, than he did in the Letters which he sent before this printed Book; for in that Letter which he wrote

wrote to a young man, who preached at Wamfroy, - he says, *That the accepters of the Indulgence could not but homologate before the Lord the Magistrates design to suppress these Meetings of the Lords people, and contribute to the carrying on of that end; and in another Letter he infers, That seeing the Magistrate had the same design in the Indulgence that he had in the band, that therefore the band and Indulgence are of a piece, and that there is no difference as to kind, betwixt the making use of the Indulgence, and the taking off the band; Though there be a magis and minus, that may be yielded; yet there is nothing that can alter the kind; nor can be see how those who are favourable to the Indulgence can, speaking consequently, condemn the taking of the Band. Here is very great confidence, but it's very groundless; for suppose the design of all that had a hand in the contriving of the Indulgence, were as ill as he could imagine, yet their design could not vitiate the acceptance of the peaceable exercise of the preaching of the Gospel, nor vitiate the hearing of the Gospel to those who preach and hear the Gospel, for that end for which God hath appointed it to be preached and heard.*

2. Whatever was the intention of the Contrivers of the Indulgence, the preaching of the Indulged Ministers had no more tendency to hinder other Ministers to preach the Gospel, than the preaching of one Minister who is not indulged, hinders the preaching of another Minister; and experience hath proven this, *That their preaching hindred others to preach; for several*

now

Non-

Non-indulged preached more since the Indulgence than before.

3. He gives a strange efficacy to the Magistrates intention, in saying, *That it makes the making use of the Indulgence and taking of the band, to be of a peice, and of one kind*; for the band which he speaks of, obliges to conform to Prelacy, and to cast off the outed Ministers, yea, and shut up their bowels from them in their distress; and the person who takes it, declares Conventicles to be disorderly, and the walking according to the Law which establishe Prelacy, to be orderly walking.

They who think that the Magistrates intention can make these things contained in that band to be of a piece, and of the same kind with the peaceable exercise of preaching the Gospel, they give the Magistrate a power of working Miracles, in changing the nature of things by his intention, which is more than hath been given to Magistrates by those who talk highest of their Supremacy.

I wish he had forborn that expression of Homologating before the Lord; for it seems to be a taking of the name of God in vain.

Pag. 111. he desires us to ponder some Particulars; for the first about Magistrates design, we have weighed it, and found it light. For his second, he should have proven, That it is the necessary work of the indulged Ministers who have Churches to preach in, where the Meetings of the Lords people are not disturbed, to leave these Churches, and go to preach in
moun-

mountains, and needlessly expose themselves to hazard, when they may have the same ordinances of God in the Church, and with these advantages, That they have the accommodation of a house to shelter them from storms, that they are rid of the fears of Invasion by armed soldiers which do much disorder folks Spirits for the worship of God; and the place of meeting being fixed and known, peoples uncertain wandering upon the Lords day is prevented.

It hath been very sad to those who truly designed to sanctifie the Sabbath; to wander on the Lords day, to seek the word of God and not find it; and when they had found it, to be in a continual fear of violence; or to be fleeing, or to see some more taken up in drawing themselves up for fighting, than for drawing near to God; or to see or hear of blood mingled with Sacrifices. He should have proven that God calls the indulged Ministers to quit the peaceable exercise of their Ministry in these Parishes where they are settled; where they have opportunity to know the State, Case and Way of the people, and to apply their Doctrine suitably to the peoples Condition; and where they have opportunity to make full proof of their Ministry, in preaching, and ministring Sacraments, Catechising, visiting, exercising Church-Discipline.

The indulged Ministers are not convinced, That it's the greater good of the Church to cast these Congregations where they are desolate, and leave them to be filled with Conformists. He says, *the Indulged Ministers have given themselves*

themselves to rest under the covering of the Supremacy. This was an invidious and false aspersion ; if the giving of themselves to the work of the Ministry, be a giving of themselves to rest ; then they have given themselves to rest. Thinks he that men cannot labour in the work of the Gospel, except they carry the Gospel from mountain to hill ? Instead of the covering of the Supremacy, he should have said, Under the protection of lawful Authority ; and as Mr. H. said before the Council, The exercise of the Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority, is one of the most desirable things on earth to Ministers of the Gospel.

To his third, The case of these Ministers, who were confined to Congregations where there were Ministers settled and permitted to preach in these Parishes, was far different from the case of those who went to desolate Congregations. If they had been permitted to preach to destitute Congregations, the Lords work might have been carried on in all probability with as much success, as by their preaching in the mountains.

To his fourth, If all had refused to make any use of the Indulgence upon the grounds of this author, and the Author of the Epistle prefixed to this Book, and of the *Cup of cold Water* ; In all appearance this would have been the result of it, that the Magistrate being more provoked, would have raised more forces to have suppressed Conventicles ; and this would have exposed more to suffering, and have heightened the troubles of Nonconformists ; so that the execution of the
Q penal

penal Statutes, would have been objectively extended, and intensively encreased.

To his 5th. in which he says, *That all the people of these Parishes where indulged Ministers are, have been withheld or withdrawn from waiting upon the Lord, at these blessed and wonderfully countenanced occasions ; whereby the followers of the Lord are broken, divided, and weakened, and so become a more ready prey to the Adversary.*

I answer, It were to be wished, That the blessing of these occasions had been really as great as it was called ; many who had no prejudice against, but loved these occasions, have found by sad experience, that all was not Gold that glistered ; and so many people who for a time ran to these occasions, have by their practises, which are not suitable to the Gospel, confirmed the sad truths which outed Ministers who heard of, or observed their way, preached to them ; and they have too much verified the fearful apprehensions that they had concerning them, and the tendency of their way. There were some observed, That they did not find the people who withdrew from indulged Ministers, any whit better, either in their knowledge, or in their Conversation, by their withdrawing ; but several of them to decline in both, and to become more vain and censorious, and addicted to evil-speaking. The people who did not withdraw from the Indulged Ministers, are very unjustly charged with dividing. If they who attended the Ordinances of the Lord dispensed by indulged Ministers, were following the

the Lord in doing so, then by their attendance they did not break off from the followers of the Lord.

To his 6th. I have answered in speaking to his 4th. There is greater probability of sad consequences that would have followed upon an absolute refusal of making any use of the Indulgence, than there is of these good consequences which he imagines would have followed upon the refusal of it.

His 7th. is a meer begging of the question; and so is his 8th. For the indulged Ministers have not exposed other Ministers who are not indulged, to any cruelties or barbarities. I perceive by his way of reasoning, if the Council had a little after the Act of *Glasgow*, retracted that Act, and have given all these Ministers liberty to return to their several Parishes; if they had excepted but one or two, this Author could not have allowed of their return; for he would have interpreted this to be an exposing of those who were excepted, to the fury of Adversaries, and would have condemned them as guilty of all the cruelties which the excepted persons might meet with. By the same reason prisoners imprisoned for the truth, might not accept of freedom from prison, except they were all released at once; by this means one wilful man who would refuse to accept of liberty from prison upon very honest and just terms, might keep a hundred or thousand who had freedom to accept of release upon such honest and just terms; I say this one might keep them all in prison by this Argument, That their leaving of him, would expose him to more severity.

His 12th. and last head of Arguments against the accepting of the Indulgence, as taken from the real ground of offence, which he alledges was in the accepting of the Indulgence, and the scandal that was thereby given to one and other: And this he saith, *is valid enough alone to militate against it, and sufficient to condemn it unto all who understand the nature of scandal; and the dreadfulnes of the sin of giving scandal by any thing we do, whether as to matter or manner; and who remember what Christ and his Apostles have said of this.*

Ans. The all who understand the nature of scandal, are not so many as it seems the Author hath imagined; the greatest Divines, who have searched most into the nature of Scandal, have found it very intricate and obscure.

Mr. Rutherford in his dispute touching Scandal and Christian liberty, subjoyned to his Divine right of Church-government, pag. 81. saith, *That the Doctrine of Scandal is more intricate and obscure than every Divine conceives. If folk would forbear to condemn the practises of others as scandalous, until they understood the nature of Scandal, there would be much less Scandal in the World than there is; there are many who give Scandal by calling these things scandalous which are not scandalous. It's a grievous sin, though many be not aware of it, to add to the word of God, in making more sins, and scandalous sins, than they can prove to be sins or scandalous sins from the perfect rule of the word of God.*

Mr. Rutherford shews in the forecited dispute, That many alledged, *That there was Scandal given by tolling of Bells, and Ministers preaching in a Gown;*

Gown; and naming the days of the week from the Planets; as Sunday from the Sun, and Monday from the Moon, &c. and in worshipping in Churches which had been built in the times of Popery to the honour of some Saint. But he shews that these were not Scandals given, but taken; for, saith he, pag. 53. we read not of Scandals culpable in Gods word, but there be some apparent moral reasons in them; it's not enough to alledg that this or that is Scandalous, but we must, if we would prove any thing scandalous, shew that there is a moral reason, and an apparent moral reason in such things, which renders them scandalous. The Lords people would be deprived of the liberty where-with Christ hath made them free, and brought under an intolerable yoke of bondage, if they were obliged to abstain from every thing which either the malicious, or the weak would alledg without reason to be scandalous. There is no way (saith the Author) to evite the force of this Argument, but by affirming and proving the Action at which the offence is taken, or may be taken, is not only lawful in it self, but as circumstantial, is expedient and necessary to be done.

Ans. The Aurhor should, if he would have said any thing to the purpose, have proven, or at least endeavoured to have proven, that the acceptance of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority; or which is all one, the acceptance of the Relaxation of that Civil restraint which had so long restrained the publick exercise of the Ministry, That this acceptance did give offence, or was of it self an occasion of stumbling or ruine; or that it was inductive to sin. He should have proven,

that this deed was such a deed, *quod de sui ratione haberet, quod esset inductivum ad peccandum*. But instead of doing this, he tells us, *That when offence is taken, or may be taken at an action, they who do that action must prove it, not only lawful in it self, but that as circumstantial, it's expedient and necessary to be done*; and if they cannot prove the necessity of what they do, then the Author concludes from the offence taken at the action, that the action gives offence: but he should have proven, that abstinence from making use of the Indulgence, or forbearance of the acceptance of it, was necessary, by shewing that acceptance gave offence, or was inductive to 'em. He is accusing the indulged Ministers, and affirming them to be guilty of giving offence, by the acceptance of the Indulgence; and should have proven his alledgance that there was something wrong, something inordinately done in this acceptance of this relaxation. And beside, it's hard enough to condemn all as guilty of active scandal, who cannot prove that their actions are expedient and necessary; for every one who doth what is really expedient and necessary, hath not the faculty of proving every expedient and necessary action to be expedient and necessary; if the thing be really expedient and necessary which is done, there is no active Scandal given by it, though the doer cannot formally prove the expediency and necessity of what is done: for he may possibly be so weak, as not to understand the importance of the words or terms of expediency and necessity, nor to hit upon the proper

proper grounds and midfes which prove this expediency and neceffity. Suppose fome did now take offence at the eating of Swines-flesh or blood, though the person who eated blood, could not prove the expediency or neceffity of his eating Swines-flesh or blood, yet the offence would be taken, and not given ; and it were incumbent to the person that took offence, to prove that the eating of Swines-flesh and blood were unlawful and forbidden ; or if any take offence at worshipping God in Kirks builded in the times of Popery, for *Paul*, or *Peter*, or *Cuthbert* ; and alledg that is is not necessary to worship God in these Kirks, because men may worship God in the open fields, or in other houses, which were not builded for any Saint ; though every man who worships God in these Kirks builded in the times of Popery, to the honour of some Saint, cannot prove the necessity of worshipping in this or that individual Kirk ; yet the offence is not given, but taken ; as Mr. *Rutherford* shews in that dispute of Scandal, formerly cited Quest. 6. in the 61. and following pages ; and shews, *That it's necessary for those who take offence at worshipping in such Kirks, to prove by Scripture-warrant, that it is necessary to disuse these Kirks.* It is certain, saith he, *That the necessity of disusing the Creature in a Physical usage in the worship of God, must have a warrant in the Scripture ;* and so he shews, *That the offence that some take at Bells, for convening the people to the worship of God, is a meer passive Scandal.*

And I suppose, it cannot be denied, that the

protection of lawful Authority, is more necessary for the conventions of the Lords People for his worship, than these Houses or Bells.

The Author lays the stress of the Scandal which he alledges was given by accepting of the Indulgence, upon this ground, *That this acceptance as circumstantial, was not expedient and necessary*; and he supposes, that it will be easily granted, *That the acceptance of the Indulgence was not a thing in its self necessary, so as it could not be refused without manifest sin against the Lord.*

Ans. It is ordinary, I perceive, with this Author in this History, to take for granted that which he should prove; as for that which he adds, *That if there be not a manifest sin in refusing the Indulgence, then the taking of offence at the acceptance of it, will prove that there was offence given in the acceptance*; will not be so easily granted as he supposes: For suppose that one could not make it manifest and evident, that there were sin against the Lord in demolishing or disusing St. Giles or St. Cuthberts Kirk, or in breaking or disusing the Bells which had been abused in the time of Popery; it were very hard to condemn that man, who together with the rest of the Lords people convened for the worship of God at St. Giles's Kirk, upon the ringing of Bells, which had been abused in the times of Popery; I say it were hard to condemn him of the sin of giving Scandal, in his going to these Kirks upon the ringing of these Bells.

As for the expediency and necessity of making use of the relaxation of the rigour of the pena

penal statutes, as before explained ; or which is all one, accepting of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority ; the indulged Ministers have much to say for the expediency and necessity of this acceptance, and for their not refusing this relaxation and protection when offered.

1. Some things are necessary by Divine Ordination, as Magistracy ; *Whosoever resists the power, saith the Apostle, resists the Ordinance of God ; and the Powers that be, are ordained of God, Rom. 13. 1, 2. &c.* And as Magistracy, so Ministry is the Ordinance of God, 1. Cor. 12. 28. *And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, &c.*

2. Some things are necessary by Divine Precept ; as for example, the exercise of the power of the Magistrate is not only necessary by virtue of Gods instituting and ordaining Magistracy, but also by the command of God, which obliges Magistrates to punish vice, to execute wrath upon them who do evil, to promote, encourage and praise that which is good ; to protect their Subjects in well-doing, and to preserve peace. And so Ministers are under a necessity of preaching the Gospel by the command of God.

3. Some things are necessary, because God hath madethem useful and convenient for man, and hath given them to man for his use ; they are in their nature convenient for man, given and designed of God for the good of man ; thus meat and cloathing, and houses, peace, and the protection

tection of lawful Authority, are necessary.

4. Some things are necessary means in order to a necessary end; and these again are necessary, either simply for attaining the end, or necessary for the better or more easie and convenient attaining of the end; as a house is necessary, not simply for hearing of the word, but for the more convenient hearing of the word, because it shelters the Minister and people from storms, winds, and scorching heat, &c. Thus the protection of lawful Authority is necessary for the peaceable hearing of the word without disturbance.

5. Some things are necessary for preventing of evil; the evil either of sin, or of affliction and calamity.

6. Some things become necessary, or the more necessary to be done, because of those who urge the forbearance of them out of some erroneous principle, or for establishing of some error. And thus Mr. Rutherford sheweth in the forecited Treatise, *That to forbear the eating of Swines-flesh before a few, who alledges that it is a sin, or breach of the Commandment of God to do so; to forbear it now when we are fully possessed in that liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, were to harden the few in his Judaism; and the way to bring us again under the yoke of the Ceremonial Law.*

Now 1. seeing God hath ordained Magistracy for protection of his servants and people, and for protecting them in the exercise of his worship, it was expedient and necessary to accept of this Protection when offered, and not to refuse it; for the acceptance of the effect and product

duct of the exercise of that Authority which is Gods Ordinance, was an acknowledgment and owning the Ordinance of God; a honouring of those to whom by Divine appointment honour is due. And this was a contributing to render the Ordinance of God effectual for that end for which he had instituted and ordained it; and upon the contrary, the refusing of this relaxation, and of the protection of lawful Authority, would have been a slighting and despising of the Ordinance of God, and a doing of that which tended to render the Ordinance of God ineffectual for that end and use for which God ordained it. Now the relaxation of this restraint which had been long upon the publick exercise of their Ministry, and the protection of lawful Authority, which Mr. H. accepted of, was the very exercise of that Authority which is the Ordinance of God.

2. Seeing the Magistrate in loosing that restraint which hindred the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, did his duty, he did somewhat of that which he was obliged to do; it was necessary that the Ministers whom they were willing to loose from the restraint formerly laid on, and whom they were willing to protect in the exercise of their Ministry, should in their place and station further and promote the Magistrate in any good which he was willing to do; as when a Minister is willing to do his duty in preaching and Catechising, the people should be willing to hear and be Catechised; so when a Magistrate is willing to permit or allow Ministers to preach in his Dominions, and to protect them
in

in the exercise of their Ministry, it's the duty of Ministers who have the access to the peaceable exercise of their Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority, to accept of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry; and to refuse this offer, were the way to mar and stifle the good which the Magistrate was willing to do. Now when the Magistrate is willing to do any thing which is right and his duty, it's a sin to mar, impede, and stifle any good that he is willing to do.

3. Seeing peace and the protection of lawful Authority, and the peaceable exercise of the Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority, are great blessings of God, and God promises and gives them to his people as great benefits, and his people are obliged to pray for them, *Isa.* 48. 18. *Isa.* 60. 15, 16, 17, 18. *Isa.* 11. 6, 7, 8, 9. *1 Tim.* 2. 1, 2. Therefore it's necessary to accept these mercies and benefits when the Lord in his Providence offers and gives them; and to refuse them when they are offered, were to slight the mercies of God, and to refuse what we are bound to seek, and to be thankful for, when we get it.

4. Seeing the fixed, settled, and peaceable exercise of the Ministry, is so necessary, as appears from the Lords taking care that Ministers might be settled in Cities and Churches; and from the many conveniencies of a settled Ministry, which are wanting in an unfixed Ministry; for they who may not stay among a people, cannot so know their state and case, and so cannot apply their Doctrine suitable to their case; and can-

cannot make full proof of their Ministry among them, in laying the foundation in all the principles of the doctrine of God ; and then leading the people forward unto greater perfection in knowledge in declaring the whole Counsel of God ; and they have not access to Catechise, and visit, &c. as those who have the settled and fixed exercise of their Ministry have ; and then peace and quietness in preaching and hearing the Gospel , hath many conveniencies ; people not only know whither they shall go to hear, but they may come seasonably without hazard by the way, and without fear of disturbance when they are come ; so that they may more compose themselves for hearing, than they can who are in a continual apprehension of a hostile Invasion, and often alarmed with hearing or seeing some noise or appearance of armed soldiers. These fears and confusions are great Impediments of the sanctification of the Sabbath.

Now the settled and peaceable exercise of the Ministry, which is so many ways expedient and necessary, cannot be had but by the Magistrate ; and therefore to have refused to make any use of the Indulgence , had been to refuse the settled and peaceable exercise of the Ministry.

5. This acceptance was useful for preventing many evils of sin and calamity. The indulged Ministers could not see how they could without sin refuse to make any use of the Indulgence ; and they conceived their refusal to take the benefit of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry , would have given occasion of offence,

fence and provocation to the Magistrate, and to the destitute Congregations who desired their help; the desire of a people who are wandring as sheep without a Shepherd, had a cry that they could not see how they could flight without sin. The acceptance prevented the filling of the Kirk with a Conformist, whom the people would not have heard; and freed those Parishes of the quarterings, plunderings, imprisonments, which they were formerly obnoxious unto; it prevented their uncertain wandrings on the Sabbath, their disquieting and confounding fears, their running and fleeing on the Sabbath, which is such a calamity, that our Saviour directs the Jews to pray that their flight might not be in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day, *Matth. 24.* and prevented rendevousing, and fighting, and mingling blood with Sacrifices on the Lords day. The many disorders and confusions, and sad sufferings, the imprisonments and finings, and banishments, and the great effusion of the blood of the people of God, which have followed upon the hostile clashings betwixt Magistrates and people, may teach us how necessary the peaceable exercise of the Ministry under lawful Authority is, and how necessary it is to take, and seek, and follow after peace with all men; especially with the Magistrate

The Indulged Ministers cannot, nor could not see how a refusing to have any making or meddling with the Magistrate, which these Authors urge, could consist with the respect due to Authority, or with that command, *follow peace with all men;*
and

and if it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.

6. The refusing to make any use of the Indulgence upon the grounds that these Authors go upon, would make the refusing scandalous, because refusing upon their grounds, would establish several scandalous errors; as for example, the Author of the *Cup of cold Water*, and of the Epistle prefixed to this History of the Indulgence, alledges, *That no use should have been made of the Indulgence, because no Proposals made by the Magistrates, should be listned to; no Proposals should be made to them, nothing should be sought or taken from them; that there should be no making or meddling with them; and further he asserts, That this course is that which God calleth us to; and that this is the way wherein alone we can expect Gods approbation.* And he builds these errors upon false grounds, which we have before refuted; and the principal ground upon which he builds these wild conceits, is, because the Magistrate hath assumed an unlawful Supremacy, which establishes this error in the minds of those that believe him, That when the Magistrate assumes any such Supremacy, it makes void that Authority which he hath from God.

The Author of the History goeth upon the same ground, and alledges no liberty, though free of all entanglements and grounds of scrupling, should be made use of, seeing Adversaries are not really repenting; and that any such permission could not be supposed to flow from right principles and right designs, which fixes that
error

error in the minds of those who will believe him, That except the Magistrate be really penitent, and act from right principles and designs, no use can be made of any permission to preach the Gospel granted by him. These are errors scandalous and of dangerous consequence ; he also goes upon this ground, That the indulgence should be refused, because the Magistrate appoints or permits to preach in a certain place. Now we saw from the first Book of Discipline, that the Magistrate may in some cases appoint Ministers to preach in some places ; and in the second Book of Discipline, That the Magistrate may in some cases place Ministers ; and if a Magistrate might in no case appoint a Minister to preach in a certain place, but only might appoint him to preach ; then a Minister, if he were ill-disposed, might elude the design of a godly Magistrate ; for he might preach where there were no need of his preaching, and not there where the Magistrate findeth greatest need ; or he might preach where there were few or none to hear him ; and so render the appointment and the design of the Magistrate, who intended the edification of his Subjects, of no effect. His concluding, that no use could be made of the Indulgence, because the Magistrates wrote Instructions for the indulged Ministers, does establish that error, That the Magistrate by writing Instructions for Ministers, may bind up the Ministers Conscience that he cannot preach any where, where the Magistrate permits him to preach, and writes Instructions for him. To have refused to make
any

any use of the Indulgence upon these grounds, had been to give a great number of dangerous offences, and to fix these errors which are of dangerous consequence. But the acceptance of the Relaxation, and of the Protection of lawful Authority, did not give offence, but was for edification.

If he object, as he doth elsewhere, *That there was no absolute necessity of their peaceable preaching, for they might have preached with hazard as others did in the mountains; and therefore there was no absolute necessity of their acceptance of the Indulgence; and therefore in accepting it, they gave scandal.*

I answer: That it will not follow, that the acceptance did give scandal, because there was no absolute necessity of acceptance; for there is no absolute necessity of making use of the Churches builded in the times of Popery to such or such Saints; nor is there an absolute necessity of making use of Bells to convene the people, because the people may meet elsewhere than in these Churches; and they may be convened, though not so conveniently without Bells. And yet Mr. Rutherford sheweth, *That there is no offence given by making use of these Churches and Bells, because they have a real usefulness, and are in a sort, though not simply, necessary.*

Again I retort: Preaching in the Mountains is not absolutely and simply necessary; for if that were true, all people, though all the Reformed Churches, behoved to forsake the Kirks, and go to the field; and there ought to be no

R.

preach-

preaching in any place of the World, but in fields and Mountains. But I suppose he would have been far from saying that the preaching in the Mountains did give offence to those who took offence at it; so that a less necessity than that which is simple and absolute, is sufficient to prevent an active scandal.

Again, though there be not an absolute necessity of peaceable preaching, because the Gospel hath been and may be preached where the Magistrate is Pagan and doth not permit it; yet the peaceable exercise of the Ministry is very desirable, and as we heard before, the fixed peaceable exercise of the Ministry is very necessary, in order to many good uses, and to prevent many ills; and therefore when the Lord inclines the heart of Rulers to grant it, it is necessary not to neglect it.

The disputes of our Predecessors against the *English* Popish Ceremonies, does no way quadrate with his disputes against the acceptance of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry under the protection of lawful Authority; for our Predecessors proved, That these Ceremonies were the meer Inventions and Devices of men, will-worship, contrary to the second Commandment, and that they were nocent and hurtful; but he hath not proven by his foregoing Arguments, That the aforesaid acceptance was sinful; he says indeed, *That he hath sufficiently done it*, but we have seen the insufficiency of his proofs.

Again,

Again, they who pleaded for these Ceremonies, granted that they were indifferent, and the Nonconformists argued against them upon this supposition; but the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, and the protection of lawful Authority, are not the Inventions of men, but Ordinances of God, and not indifferent; but many ways expedient and necessary.

He says also, *That there was a manifest appearance of evil in this acceptance*; but he doth not prove it. That place i *Thes.* 5. 17. is rendred by some thus, *Abstain from all kind of evil*. If it be rendred appearance, the ill appearance must be in the object, and not in the distempered eye and conceit. Some folk apprehend appearances of evil in things which have no appearance of evil in themselves, but all the appearance is in their own phansie and conceit. Mr. *Durham* in his Treatise of Scandal, pag. 6, 7. gives, for example, of this appearance of evil, dangerous and doubtful expressions of Doctrine that have been or use to be abused, and practices which are not becoming that honesty and good report which a Christian ought to study.

The Author hath not made it manifest, That this acceptance was any kind of evil, or such an appearance of evil. It's superfluous to run through the rest of this head, because he doth not prove that the acceptance gave offence to any persons, only he reckons up several persons to whom he alleges it gave offence; and if accusations make guilty, the Author hath made the indulged Ministers very guilty; but it's but a guilt of his making.

king. I shall only clear, That the eating or not eating of the meats the Apostle speaks of in the place cited by the Author, was every way indifferent at that time, and so cannot be a parallel of the acceptance of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, and the Protection of lawful Authority, which are not things meerly indifferent. The indifferency of eating or not eating of such or such meats at that time, is excellently cleared by Mr. *Rutherford* in his forecited Treatise of Scandal; because the Book is not common, I shall transcribe one Objection and Answer, in which as in many other parts of that Treatise, there are several things apposite to the present debate of Scandal. 'Pag. 67. And before I come to the 'second Conclusion, an House for the worship 'of God, are among the things which are necessary, by way of disjunction. *in specie*, not *in individuo*; that is, a house is necessary in its Physical use to fence off our bodies the injuries of 'Sun, Air, and heat; but not this house; for another house may serve the turn as conveniently.

'But some object, Then this or that house 'dedicated superstitiously to the religious Honour of a Saint, ought to be removed out of 'the worship of God. 1. Because by your own 'Confession, this individual house so abused, is 'not necessary. God may well be worshipped 'without this house, though it had never been '*in rerum natura*. 2. From the worshipping of 'God in so superstitious a place, many truly 'godly are so scandalized, that for worshipping
God

God in such superstitious and idolatrous places,
 they have separated from your Church, con-
 ceiving that in so doing, you heal the wounds
 of the Beast. It's true, it may be their weak-
 ness; yea, but be it so, that it were their wick-
 edness, that they are scandalized; yet by
 your Doctrine in things not necessary, you are
 not to do any thing by which either the weak
 or the wicked may be scandalized, as is clear
 in the eating of Meats, *Rom. 14.*

Ans. This Argument may (1.) be retorted
 against those who hold with us in the same Do-
 ctrine of Scandal; for without eating of Swines-
 flesh my life may be preserved; and a malici-
 ous Jew may be, and is necessarily highly scan-
 dalized that I, who possibly am a Jew convert-
 ed to the Christian Faith, do eat Swines-flesh
 before him; for he conceiveth me to be an A-
 postate from *Moses's* Law; therefore I should
 abstain from eating Swines-flesh before a Jew,
 who out of malice is scandalized by my doing
 a thing not necessary *hic & nunc*; but the Con-
 clusion is absurd; nor do I think, That many
 truly godly of the strictest Separation, do stum-
 ble at our Churches out of wickedness; many
 truly godly and sincere refuse to come to our
 Churches; whereas many scandalous, well-lu-
 stered Hypocrites, who know nothing of the
 power of Godliness, but are sitten down in the
 Scorners chair, are admitted to the Lords Sup-
 per; and as the former cannot be excused, so
 I pray God that the latter draw not down
 the wrath of God upon both Kingdoms.

(2.) Things not necessary, which actively pro-
 duce Scandal, must not only be indifferent Physi-
 cally in their natural use, as this or that House,
 but they must be indifferent both Physically
 and Morally ; for the meats spoken of, *Rom. 14.*
 at that time were both ways indifferent.
 1. They were not necessary, but indifferent
 Physically in an ordinary Providence both then
 and now ; for ordinarily my life may be pre-
 served, and suffer little loss by not eating Swines-
 flesh, or such meats ; in case of extream ne-
 cessity of starving, if any could have no other
 meat, they might eat then, as the Case was, *Rom.*
14. because mercy is better than Sacrifice at all
 times. 2. These things, *Rom. 14.* were indiffe-
 rent Theologically or Morally in their own
 nature, (1.) *Ver. 3. Let not him that eateth, despise*
him that eateth ; not and let not him that eateth
not, despise him that eateth ; for God hath received
him. (2.) Because *ver. 17. the Kingdom of God is*
not meat and drink. Surely in *Moses's* time, to
 abstain from such meats, and eat such as the
 Lamb of the Passover, the Manna, to drink of
 the water of the Rock, was Worship, and is
 some part of the Kingdom of Heaven ; but it is
 not so now, saith *Paul.* 3. *Paul* clearly maketh
 them morally indifferent, *1 Cor. 8. 8. For meat*
commendeth us not to God : for neither if we eat,
are we better (morally before God) neither
if we eat not are we (morally) the worse. Now
 this Temple or House Physically, is indifferent
 and not necessary for the Worship of God ; for
 men may be defended from the injuries of Sun
 and

'and Alt, though this House had never been in
 ' *rerum natura* : But this Temple or House, though
 ' dedicated to a Saint, is not morally indifferent,
 ' but morally necessary; so as if you remove it
 ' from the Worship, because abused to Idolatry,
 ' and give it no use in the defending of our Bo-
 ' dies from the injuries of the Wind, Rain, and
 ' Sun, you Judaize, and do actively scandalize
 ' the Jews, and harden them in their Apostacy;
 ' and so this House, though abused to Idolatry, is
 ' not indifferent morally, as the meats, *Rom.* 14.
 ' But the using of it is necessary, and an asser-
 ' ting of our Christian liberty, as to eat blood
 ' and things strangled even before a Jew. So to
 ' use all houses for a Physical end to defend our
 ' bodies from Heat and Cold, is a part of the
 ' liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free;
 ' but Céremonies have no natural nor Physical
 ' use; the crossing of the Air with the Thumb,
 ' the keeping of a day religiously without war-
 ' rant of the word, are not taught in the School
 ' of Nature, and so are naturally not necessary, as
 ' this or that House though abused to Superstition
 ' is; and the Adversaries that say they are morally
 ' indifferent, as good and as spiritual Ceremonies
 ' in kind and nature, may be devised in their
 ' place. But in all this dispute of Scandal, we
 ' give, but we never grant that the Ceremonies
 ' are indifferent; we dispute here, That they are
 ' scandalous, and so unlawful in their use, upon the
 ' Principles of Formalists; whereas we judge
 ' them in their Nature, because they have not
 ' God, but the will of men to be their Father and

‘ Author to be unlawful and repugnant to Scripture, because not warranted by either command, practise, or promise in Scripture.

So far Mr. *Rutherford*: from which we may see, that the using of a House, though it hath been idolatrously abused, for this end to defend our bodies from heat and cold, is a part of the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. Now any who will not shut their eyes, may see that the seeking and taking the Protection of lawful Authority, is more necessary than the making use of this or that individual House. We cannot have the benefit of publick houses for worship, without the Magistrate.

But secondly, The Protection of the Magistrate defends from injuries that are much more injurious and hurtful, than the injuries of Wind and Rain, and scorching by the Sun; a house can but defend from showers of Rain, Hail, scorching-Heat, &c. but the Protection of lawful Authority defends from showers of Bullets, and the scorching-Heat of Persecution.

Again, men might be sheltered by another house, though *St. Cuthberts*, or *St. Giles’s* Kirk, were cast down; but the peaceable exercise of the preaching and hearing of the word in publick, cannot be had without the Protection of Civil Authority.

Now if the Scandal taken at taking the shelter of *St. Cuthberts* Kirk in hearing the word, should not make folk disuse that Kirk, nor deprive themselves of the use of it; much less should the taking offence at the taking of the Protection of lawful Authority for the publick peaceable exer-

exercise of the Ministry, make Ministers and people deprive themselves of the Protection of Magistrates, whom the Lord calls the Shields of the earth; seeing the Magistrates permitting and allowing Ministers to preach, and protecting them in preaching, is the very exercise of that Authority which they have from God for good.

And further, from Mr. *Rutherford's* words we may see, That the eating or not eating, in the places cited by the Author, does no way quadrate with the case of acceptance or no acceptance; for as Mr. *Rutherford* shews, That at that time the eating or not eating, was both Physically and Morally indifferent.

The Author hath not proven the acceptance or no acceptance to be indifferent; and any who will take up this Club and Quarrel, will find it a hard task to prove the acceptance or no acceptance Physically and Morally indifferent; and so the case, *Rom.* 14. *1 Cor.* 8. do no way quadrate with this. The eating of flesh forbidden in the Ceremonial Law, was no ways necessary at that time, when the Apostle *Paul* wrote his Epistles to the *Romans*; and his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, it was neither Physically nor Morally necessary at that time, to eat those fleshes before a weak Jew; for they who knew their Christian liberty, might eat those fleshes in private, and when such weak Brethren were not present. But the acceptance of the relaxation of the Civil restraint formerly laid on by the Magistrate, the acceptance of the Protection of lawful Authority, was several ways necessary, as we saw before. The
peace-

peaceable, fixed, settled preaching and hearing of the Gospel, is a very desirable end; and the acceptance of the Protection of Civil Authority is necessary in order to this end; for as the Reverend Author of the late Apology, printed Anno 1677. acknowledgeth the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, is from the Magistrate; pag. 111. where he grants, *That it is within the compass of the Magistrates power to give liberty to Ministers and people for serving and worshipping of God in his Son Jesus Christ. This, saith he, we do not deny, but chearfully grant, That although the exercise of Church-power, that is properly such, be independent on the Magistrate, yet the peaceable exercise of it is truly from him.*

Pag. 113. Sect. 1. He says, *That the accepters of the Indulgence did hereby give offence to such of their Brethren as had the offer, but were not cleared, nor convinced of the lawfulness of the embracing of such a favour at such a time.* Now how proves he this, That they gave offence? For, saith he, *by their example these were encouraged and moved to do that which they judged sinful and unlawful for them to do.* I wonder how a reasonable man, who had read any thing concerning the nature of Scandal, could give such a reason; for according to this reason, whosoever does that which another judges unlawful for him to do, he by his doing gives offence; this is a most false and absurd Proposition. Our Saviour did several things which the Jews judged sinful and unlawful for them to do; but it were blasphemous to infer that therefore our Saviour in doing these things,

things, gave offence to the Jews. This Doctrine of the Author, teaches people that will believe him, to judge, that whatsoever they judge unlawful for them to do, that that is in it self sinful and unlawful; for whatsoever gives offence, is sinful; for every thing that gives offence, is some way or other inordinate; and this makes the judgment, it may be, but of one man who judges something sinful and unlawful for him to do, to bind up others that they cannot do that which he thinks sinful; for if they should do it according to this Author, they should give offence and so sin; this would make the Judgment of one erring man, who thinks that sinful which is not, so to be a Law to others, which were an intolerable yoke of bondage.

The Reverend Brethren who had not clearness to make use of the Indulgence, were far from this erroneous conceit to think, That because they had not clearness to accept of the Indulgence, that therefore they who accepted of it, did sin and give offence.

The Scriptures which he cites, as we did shew before out of Mr. *Rutherford's* Dispute of Scandal, are impertinently cited; because the eating or not eating of these meats at that time, was every way indifferent, Physically and Morally indifferent, and no way necessary; but the acceptance was in several respects necessary, as was shewed before; especially because they could not have the peaceable exercise of their Ministry without the Magistrate; but the eating of these meats the Apostle speaks of, might be forborn without
any

any prejudice to him who was perswaded of his Christian liberty ; he might forbear it without any prejudice or hurt to his body ; for he might get other meat to eat, when these weak Brethren who took offence at eating, were present : If there had been no other meat, and he would have been in hazard of his life if he did not eat ; and if he could not have gotten shifted out of the presence of these weak Brethren, then the case would have been altered, and not eating in that case had been a breach of the sixth Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*. In such a necessity it was lawful for *David* to eat the Shew-bread, and so his eating would have been necessary, and the offence would have been taken by the weak Brethren, but not given by the eater ; but if he found these meats useful for his body, and could get the presence of the weak shifted, he might eat them in private, as Mr. *Rutherford* sheweth in the foresaid Dispute.

Again, he might forbear eating without any prejudice to his soul ; because, as Mr. *Rutherford* sheweth, at that time the eating was morally indifferent ; there was no sin at that time in forbearing to eat those meats before a weak Brother. But now when we are fully possessors of our Christian liberty, it were a sin to forbear eating such meats before a Jew, because of his taking of offence at eating ; for that were an hardning of him in his Judaism.

Pag. 113. Sect. 2. he says, *They gave offence to others who had not this Indulgence in their offer, yet judged the accepting thereof unlawful upon the ground last mentioned.*

Ans.

Ans. What ground means he? if he means that ground which he lays down in the last Section near the beginning, because they judged it sinful and unlawful for themselves to have done it : We have shewed the groundlessness and falshood, and dangerous consequence of this ground; or if he mean, That the acceptance was as indifferent, and every way as unnecessary as the eating in the case that the Apostles words relate to, he is much mistaken, as appears from what is said before. He says in the end of this second Section, *That they should have refused the Indulgence, seeing there wanted not who told them of the evil they conceived to lye therein.*

But 1. as I shewed before, this reason is not relevant; for it makes the judgment of one man to be an obliging Rule to another.

2. The Indulged Ministers did see and acknowledge the evils which were in the complex Acts of the Magistrate, which related to the Indulgence.

3. The Reverend Brethren who had not clearness to make use of the Indulgence, did not tell the indulged Ministers, That there was evil in accepting of the relaxation of the restraint; or that there was evil in accepting of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, or of the Protection of lawful Authority in the exercise of their Ministry; so that these Reverend Brethren did not say, That there was evil in what the Indulged accepted, for these were the things which the indulged Ministers accepted, as we cleared from Mr. H's speech before the Council; but on the contrary, they declare, That there is good in this, as appears from

— from Mr. *Burnets* Paper, set down in this History, pag. 46. Sect. 5. As for the permission and allowance I have to preach when confined, this permission seemeth very far, when I look on it abstractly without relation to the rest of the particular Circumstances of the Act ; for this would look like the opening of the door in part which the Magistrate himself had shut ; and afterward he says, *For permission to preach in any vacant Church within the Kingdom, is so very great a favour, as for which I would desire to bless God, and thank his Majesty most heartily.* And in his Letter to my L. Chancellor, pag. 48. he shews himself clear for Ministers going not only to their former Charges, but to other Congregations as they shall have opportunity of a cordial Invitation from the people.

And in the other Paper drawn up by the ten Ministers, set down pag. 48, 49, 50, 51. of this History, in the 51. page their third desire to the Council is, *That your L. L. would be pleased to deal with his Majesty to take off the legal restraints on our Ministry and Persons, that we may peaceably give our selves to the work of the Ministry for the edification of the body of Christ.* And we heard from pag. 111. of the late Apology, That the peaceable exercise of the Ministry is from the Magistrate ; so that these Reverend Ministers were so far from accounting that evil, which the indulged Ministers accepted, that they accounted it desirable, and did desire it ; and by this it may appear how far these Reverend Ministers were from the Sentiments of this
 Author

Author of the History, and the Author of the *Cup of cold Water*, and of the Letter prefixed to the History of the Indulgence.

The difference betwixt those Reverend Brethren who did not accept, and these who did accept, was not in their Principles anent the Government of the Church; nor did they differ anent the ills which are in the complex Acts of the Indulgence, which both by word and writings drawn up by the consent of Indulged and not Indulged Ministers, is manifest; but the difference was in this, That the indulged Ministers conceived that it was their duty to take what was good in the Indulgence, and refuse what was evil.

The Reverend Brethren who had no clearness to accept, conceived that in taking the good, they would be some way involved in an interpretative approbation of the evil; and this difference of apprehension, as it was no ground of division, so it made no division betwixt the indulged Ministers and their Brethren who were not indulged; only about the time of the second Indulgence, one or two at most of Ministers that were ordained before the Revolution, began to drop first more privately, and then more publickly, some seeds of Schism among the people who before were profiting under the Ministry of the indulged Ministers; and then some young men, whose Judgments had not been formed at Colleges of Divinity under Orthodox Doctors of Divinity (which is an unspeakable loss to many well inclined youths) and who were not studied in Divinity, were not acquainted with the writings of

of Nonconformists against Schism, through a rashness very incident to young men who want experience, did further distemper the poor people; and perceiving that some people were very fond upon those Preachers who spoke most against the Indulgence, and cryed them most up; this was a great snare to these youths, and a great grief to the grave judicious Ministers, who were not indulged.

It was not the Councils design, as some alledge, but this stickling in preaching things which tended to division, which divided the people. It is not designs of Magistrates to divide which doth really divide; nay any that have sense, if they perceive that Magistrates have a mind to divide them, they will so much the more study unity; but if the Contrivers of the Indulgence had a design of dividing, it was those who vented divisive Doctrines in publick and private who did effectuate that design, which would never have been effectual without this. I shall subjoyn the words of the reverend Author of the Apology, published *An. 1677.* who is commended by the Author of this History. I wish the Author of the History had learned of him to seek for peace, and to render designs of division ineffectual; the Author of the History widens the wound which the Author of the Apology endeavoured to heal, as appears by what he writes, pag. 128, and 129. of that Apology. I shall transcribe his words, because they confirm what hath been said, That there is no difference in the professed Principles about the Government of

of the Church, or about the ills which are in the complex of the Indulgence, betwixt the Indulged and not Indulged Ministers: his words pag. 128. are these. For whatever difference there hath been, or yet is amongst us in our practice, in relation to the Indulgence; we are all agreed in the preceding exceptions against it; and if there had been access for presenting the same to our Rulers, our Unanimity and Concord in these, had been more discovered and made known to the World than it is; there is no change with us about our known and professed judgment about the Government of the Church in its true distinction from, and in dependance on the Magistrate, as is afterward expressed; whatever was our persuasion of this, represented to the World in our publick Confession of Faith, we yet through the Grace of God, resolve to cleave to, having never seen or heard of any thing in all the times that have gone over our heads, to cause us to alter our apprehensions of this matter in the least. Some (who take hold of all occasions to reproach us) are pleased to represent some, their acceptance of this Indulgence as contradictory to, and inconsistent with our former professed Principles anent Church-Government; yet any who consider what was shortly hinted at to the Council at the receiving of this Indulgence, and what was more largely declared by them to the Congregations at their first entry, will be sufficiently convinced of our constant adherence to our former Principles, which by this acceptance is not at all changed. It is expected from the Lovers of our righteous cause, that nothing shall be done by them toward the furtherance of the evil intents of this Indulgence;

S

but

but rather an endeavour to ^{counteract} contract and ineffectuate them, that our opposites may have no benefit therefrom, to the prejudice of the Ministers of Christ, for which we contend.

Thus far that Reverend Author of the Apology; where we see that the Indulged and Non-indulged are still united in Judgment about the Government of the Church, and in disapproving the ills which are in the complex Acts of the Indulgence; and that this Author is not pleased with those who are pleased to represent this acceptance as contradictory to, and inconsistent with our former professed Principles; and acknowledges that what these indulged Ministers spoke before the Council, and at their entry to these Congregations, is sufficient to convince their adherence to their former Principles. And he shews, that the difference is only in practice; and this difference would have been less, if some few who were against making use of the indulgence, had not obstructed a written Testimony against the ills in the complex of the Indulgence; for if that had been agreed on, more would have had clearness to have made use of the Indulgence; and then this difference of practice would have been less, if the case of others had been the same with the case of these who accepted; but this made a notable disparity in the case, that several who refused to make use of the Indulgence, refused upon this account, because they were confined and permitted to preach in Parishes which were already provided with Ministers; so that they thought their preaching there was superfluous,

fluous, and they might do more good elsewhere.

As to the Authors Sect. 3. we have shewed before, That this acceptance was no Homologation of any sinful Supremacy; and they who look on it so, the fault is in their own eye; the impertinency of the Scripture cited, we cleared before, out of Mr. *Rutherfords* dispute of Scandal.

As for his 4th. pag. 114. we shewed before, That the Indulged Ministers did not contrary to their engagements leave their Brethren. The Ministers who went to *Holland* would think they were injured, if any should alledge, That they had left their Brethren, because they took the benefits of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry under the protection of the Magistrates in *Holland*.

As for his 5th. it's false, That the hands of those who were not indulged, were weakened, the number of the bearers of burthens waxing smaller; for the indulged did still continue to be bearers of burdens; and the favour shewed to them, encouraged other Ministers to adventure to preach more and more publicly than they had done before; and there was this further advantage, That many people heard the indulged Ministers, who would not have ventured to hear other Ministers preach; so that the Indulgence was to the furtherance of the Gospel. The indulged Ministers did not step off, but stepped to their work in the Congregations to which they went; and it was no preposterous tenderness to

forbear preaching in those places which were provided with Preachers, where there was so many places where no Presbyterian Ministers were settled.

To his 6th. I have answered before, That the practice of the Indulged Ministers, did not confirm the Prelates, &c. in any defection.

To his 7th. They gave no offence to Rulers, but edified them; they did and said what tended to their edification; if they had (as the Authors would) refused to make or meddle with them at all, they would have offended by provoking them to wrath, in refusing what was good; but they took what was good, and by word and deed did shew, That they disapproved of what was ill in the complex of the Indulgence.

As for the 8th. If the practice of the indulged Ministers be rightly represented to posterity, it will edifie and not stumble. His 8th is founded upon that false foundation, that the indulged Ministers have complied with grievous usurpations.

And his 9th. upon that false ground, That the indulged Ministers have submitted to the exercise of Erastianism. It's they who spread such false aspersions of honest men, who give offence to Posterity, and the reformed Churches abroad. Let a true Narration of the practice of the indulged Ministers be given to the Reformed Churches abroad, and the indulged Ministers doubt not of the approbation of those Churches and they doubt as little, that all the reformed Churches, if they heard the strange Tenets and

divisive practices of their Authors, they would condemn them as erroneous of dangerous consequence, and some of them as striking at the very foundation of all order Civil and Ecclesiastical.

It's sad, That offences, real offences, do so abound, and that so many stumble at these offences, and that many make offences where there is none, and stumble where there is no Stumbling-block; and some stumble at the Lords Ordinances, and some stumble at others, because they hear the word; and this Author furthered that stumbling by a Letter, in which he asserted, That there was sin wrapped up in hearing the indulged Ministers; and thus poor people are taught to stumble at the means of others Edification.

Having answered his Arguments contained in his History, I shall take some notice of some things which he hath in his Letters, that nothing which hath any shadow of reason in this Authors writings, may seem to be neglected. In one of these Letters he says, *Who, I pray, amongst these Indulged men, as I say, as such (for otherways I honour such as are known to me, and shall entertain charitable thoughts of others) can be called the Ambassadors of Christ, who depend as to the actual exercise of their ministerial Function, on such immediately who never were intrusted, even as to kind, with Church-power.*

Ans. It's hard enough to reconcile this profession of Honour and Charity towards the indulged Ministers with some of his grievous reproaches

which he hath cast upon them, which have a direct and manifest tendency to render them base and contemptible, and to cast them out of the hearts and affections of all who hear and believe them.

His Question which he brings in with such a Phrase, *Who, I pray*, is a very idle Question. I suppose he is the first man, into whose head this idle imagination, That the indulged, as indulged, are the Ambassadors of Christ, did enter; did he ever hear, That any indulged, or any for them, thought or said, That they were Ambassadors for Christ, as indulged? they were Ambassadors before they were indulged, and would be Ambassadors although the Indulgence were retracted. The Magistrates Indulgence supposed them Ambassadors, and did not constitute them Ambassadors; but it may be he intends to argue thus: The indulged, as indulged, are not the Ambassadors of Christ, and therefore they are not the Ambassadors of Christ; this is a pitiful quibble! like that, An Ethiopian as he is black, is not a man; and therefore the black Ethiopian is not a man; a Physitian as he hath the Magistrates Patent to practice Physick, is not a Physitian; and therefore the Physitian who hath the Magistrates Patent, is not a Physitian. A Minister as he is banished, is not an Ambassador for Christ; and therefore a banished Minister is not an Ambassador for Christ. The antecedents are true, because blackness doth not constitute the Ethiopian a man, nor hath any essential or necessary connexion with his humanity; nor doth the Magistrates Patent institute a Physitian.

sician, nor doth banishment constitute a Minister; but the consequences are naught; for the Propositions to be supplied, are manifestly false; as for example, he who is not a man as he is black, is not a man, &c. And beside, the Syllogism is made up of Negatives, and so is no Syllogism at all. I shall subjoyn the words of a Minister not indulged, who in a Letter directed to this Historian, hath solidly refuted his Letters; and in answer to this passage of his Letters, saith, *We grant that indulged Ministers as indulged, are not Ministers, being taken reduplicatively by a specifick reduplication; and so neither banished nor imprisoned Ministers, are Ministers, as banished or imprisoned; for none will say, That the Indulgence is the formality under which they are Ministers, or the form constituent of their Ministry: We think you wrong them, and your Readers, who would obtrude such an assertion. As banished is not the constituent form of your Ministry, neither is the Indulgence, adjectum repugnans, any more than banishment or imprisonment is; that because he is indulged therefore hoc ipso he is no Minister; neither is your assertion which ye bring as a proof of this, any more true or warrantable, viz. That they have all their power of preaching derived from the Magistrate; for it is only a Civil Allowance, freeing the exercise of their Ministry in the places to which they are restricted from molestation or restraint. This Civil allowance takes away the execution of penal Laws which were against them*—*this they have from the Magistrates here, as you and some others have from the Magistrate*

where you are these years bygon for the exercise of your Ministry there ; but the Ministry it self and its exercise they have from Jesus Christ: As when the Civil Magistrate convokes a Synod, and gives a civil Tollerance and Protection to them in going, coming and sitting, which they could not have without his Command or Warrant ; though they have the intrinsick power of meeting, sitting and voting from Christ, and not from him ; howbeit the outward quiet and security of their sitting (so as none may molest them) is from him ; even so Ministers as they are indulged, have the outward civil liberty of a quiet and secure preaching of the Gospel, so that no inferiour Courts, Officers, or Soldiers, may molest them for their preaching. —

The simplex indulged Ministers implies two things, 1. As Ministers, they had before that Indulgence, and still have, a power from Christ to preach and administrate the Sacraments. 2. As Indulged, they have the quiet and safe exercise of that power, &c.

The Historian in another of his Letters misrepresents the indulged, as a fainting Party, who have departed from their suffering Brethren ; and that they strengthen the hands of the Adversary, and are for the peoples sinful compliance with this evil.

Ans. I suppose I have touched upon some of these things before. I shall only say, These Ministers have laboured, and have not fainted ; they have not shunned to declare the whole Counsel of God, nor have they withholden what was convenient for the people ; they have given the people faithful warning to beware of those evils

of the time, which the people were in hazard ; and though they think it not their duty to turn the preaching of the Gospel of peace into bitter wrathful invectives against any, especially absent persons (which is a smooth preaching to those who are present, who use not to be humbled, but rather puffed up by such invectives against others) ; and though they dare not bring railing Accusations against , nor revile nor curse those who are in lawful Authority ; nor despise dignities, nor say any thing which tends to put an evil Spirit betwixt Magistrates and people ; yet they have been far from flattering any Rulers or people in their sins, but have endeavoured to bring persons of all ranks to Repentance, as they have had access and occasion from the word to discover the evil and danger of sins of all sorts ; and they pray for Repentance to persons of all ranks ; as they think it not their duty to design to provoke any person to wrath, so they study not to please any in their sin ; but think themselves obliged to endeavour to please all unto edification, and to commend themselves, though not to the humours, yet to the Consciences of all in the sight of God. They were not, as was shewed before, by Covenant bound to be always actually under the same sufferings, that all who entered in Covenant, did fall under ; the Lord distributes sufferings among his Servants and People as he sees meet. Christ is at liberty when *John Baptist* was in Prison. It had been a very reasonless reasoning, Christ is not to be heard because he is not in prison as

John

John is: the rest of the Apostles are not to be heard, because they are free when *James* and *Peter* are in Prison; the Angel and Church of *Philadelphia* are to be disowned, because they are not under the trial that other Churches are under.

Again, there are divers kinds of suffering; the indulged Ministers have had their share of reproaches, which uses to go further than the skin; *Reproach*, saith *David*, *hath broken my heart*; *reviling Speeches are Persecutions*, Matth. 5. 11. Jer. 18. 18. they incite one another to devise devices against *Jeremiah*, and to smite him with the Tongue.

I remember not of any thing in the Letters which I have missed, except his Predictions: for the Historian is a sort of a Prophet; he hath a faculty of foretelling things to come. I know not how he hath fallen upon it, or whether it be ill come, or not; he very confidently affirmed in the year 1677. That if *Mr. John Welsh* had hearkened to the desire of drawing near to the shelter of an house for meeting with the people but for one Sabbath (though that might have contributed for taking off all Sentences against himself and others, and to an Universal Liberty for all outed Ministers to preach without Molestation) that then he would have forfeited all the protection and countenance he had singularly enjoyed before that time. This was far said. No sober judicious Person will think that it could be unlawful in such Circumstances at least, to preach at a house; but though there had been somewhat wrong

wrong in it, how comes he to know, that for that failing Mr. *Welsh* would have lost the Protection and Countenance which he had formerly enjoyed? it was presumptuous boldness for him to take upon him to determine so peremptorily concerning the forefaulting of the Protection and Countenance of God, *who hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and does for his names sake, even when his peoples sins testify against them, and remembers his Covenant and Mercy for his People.*

Another of his Predictions is, *That all indifferent Spectators will judge as he says, and that Posterity will see and say as he says, whether the indulged men will or not.* But I think they are over-credulous who will believe that he had the foreknowledge what way the Judgments of men present, and of the Generations to come, would incline and determine.

There is yet a third Prediction of another Author, which is, *That the Indulgence should become as odious and detestable to all the godly in the Land, as ever Prelacy was.* To this Prophecy the Author of the History and Letters, makes an Addition, while he says in one of his Letters, *That what that person was perswaded of, will quickly appear*; the first had only said it would be; but he says it will quickly appear, *augur augurem*; but these Prophets were so fearfully mistaken in seeing things that were, that there is very good reason to doubt of their foresight of things to come; yet there is more Art in this inartificial Argument founded upon the Authority of a man who hath but confidence to say boldly what he
says

says concerning things to come, than in many artificial Arguments; and these Predictions will go further with weak credulous people, than very solid reasons; for people of that sort especially, if they be curious, think more of a man who will take upon him to tell but some things that will be, though the event be of small consequence; than they will think of a solid, judicious man, who can tell them from the word of God what they should do, that they may glorifie and enjoy God; and therefore there is such flocking of people to *Fortune-tellers, Speamen, Dummeos, Wizzards* and *South-sayers*. Now if curious people have such a conceit of those who foretel, though they be suspected to have their Knowledge from the Devil, they will think much more of men who are in reputation for Religion; if they take on them to foretel things to come, they will readily be very desirous that such Predictions may not fail. I know one who pressed some of his acquaintance to get weapons for fighting in such a year upon this ground, That if there were not Blood that year, then such a person who had foretold that there would be Blood, would prove a false Prophet.

These Predictions are very taking, when they suit with peoples Inclinations, and when the fulfilling of these Predictions contribute to their honour; and when they who are not active in fulfilling them, are casten as ungodly and despicable; and therefore these Predictions of Ministers which did foretel, That the Indulgence

gence would become despicable, could not but be very taking with people who were inclined to despise it; and this could not but be very effectual to press them to despise it; that if they did it not, then they would be known to be none of the godly; and this would press others to despise it, that they might not be ranked among the ungodly.

I have observed, that several have an Art of bringing about several things by foretelling them; some make people offend at these things which they would never have offended at, by foretelling that the people will be offended. So Satan hath brought about many mischiefs by foretelling them and the Actors of them; this was a very effectual trick to render the Indulgence despicable, to foretel that it would become odious and detestable to all the godly; for they who believe these Predictions, would reason them, If we do not detest and hate the Indulgence, we cannot list our selves among the godly; and then if the Indulged Ministers did not relinquish the Indulgence and hate it, that they could not be reckoned among the godly; and if they did not make haste to hate it and detest it very shortly, that then they could not be accounted godly, because this Prediction was to be quickly accomplished. It was no great matter to foretell that the Indulgence and indulged Ministers would become odious, when there was so many Letters and Copies of printed Books full of odious reproaches cast at the Indulgence and Indulged Ministers, when such causes were working,

ing,

ing, and such Fire-balls cast, and the people were so prepared to take fire; it was an easie thing without any Spirit of Prophecie, to foretel a Fire when such trains were laid and kindled.

Again, when a poor Church is going to ruin, the ordinary Forerunner of that ruin, is the contempt of the Ministers, *2 Chron. last. They mocked the Messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his Prophets, until the wrath of the Lord rose against his people, till there was no remedy. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou who killest the Prophets!* read *Matth. 23. ver. 34.* to the end; so that if these two Ministers had spoken a little more indefinitely, they might have passed for pretty good Guessors, if they had said only, that the Indulgence would be detestable to the godly; but taking on them to foretel that it would be detestable to all the godly, and that quickly, hath quite broken their credit as Prophets; for there are many of the godly who have always been far from detesting the Indulgence; and they are much further from detesting it now, than before. And the Authors of these Predictions, have by these Predictions, and some other Practices of that nature, much wronged their own Reputation.

This is ordinary when a Church is going to ruin, the Despisers of the Lords Servants go before; this contempt uses to begin at some, but it spreads like Fire; and they who are most busie to bring their Brethren into Contempt, suddenly lose their own Credit; or if they continue a while to take pleasure in that Fire that consumes

sumes their Brethrens reputation, that pleasure will be readily as short as the pleasure that an envyful neighbour taketh in warming his hands at the fire which consumes his neighbours house; for the consuming Fire taking hold of his own house, doth quickly spill that sport, and turns the pleasure into sorrow and vexation.

There is yet another piece of high Presumption in one of these Letters, which is solidly refuted in a Letter directed to this Historian; I shall set it down in the words of that Letter.

You say the sin of the Indulgence, and of the Ministers throughout the Land favouring it, bath been such an unparallel'd Provocation, as God cannot forgive it till vengeance be proportionably inflicted on the Land and Posterity.

This must be indeed a very hainous and great wickedness, that is an unparrallel'd provocation, so that none hath been so great before it, nor co-existent to it; but this is a very Catachrestick Hyperbolie proceeding from excessive heat and irritation of Spirit. Is the preaching of an honest Minister after the removal of the Magistrates restraint, a greater wickedness than whoredoms, Incests, Witchcrafts, Idolatries, Persecutions that have been or are acted; the abominations of Popery in Doctrine, cruel Massacres, Torturing, Death, taught, authorized and practised by the Man of Sin, on whose forehead are written Abominations? This is an unparrallel'd excess of expressions!

His Hyperbolick exaggeration is very presuming upon the Sovereign power of Gods mercy
and

and will not go well down with those who have found and high thoughts of God's Sovereignty; it will be to them *durus sermo & audax*.

Gods power either of doing or forgiving, is either *potentia absoluta*, which is considered as abstracted or prescinded from his Decrees; whether revealed or secret; of this we suppose you do not speak; for if he had not decreed temporal punishments, none will say, but that God might have not decreed them, and so not executed them, and yet have pardoned the sin upon believing in Christ; and this even those who say, That punitive Justice is essential to God, do grant, that as to the egressions of it, in its acts on the creature, its free.

This Owen in his *Diatrib. de Fure & Justitia Dei* doth yield, and yet he doth very strenuously, contrary to Twisse and Rutherford, assert, That *punitive Justice is essential to God, prescinding from all Decrees*.

Or, 2. Gods power is *potentia ordinata* by himself, which is either by his secret Decrees, or such as are revealed in his word. Now as that *potentia Dei*, to do or forgive sin, which is secret and not revealed, we are not to search into it, far less to determine what it is; and as for that *potentia ordinata*, by his Decrees revealed, we ought to search, and may assert what we find himself determines it to be; so that if it be revealed, God will not pardon such a sin without vengeance proportionably executed upon the Land and Posterity; one may say, God will not pardon it till vengeance, &c. But it is a harsh word, even then and
in

in that case, to say God cannot pardon it till vengeance be executed; but where is it revealed in the word, That God cannot, or God will not pardon it till vengeance, &c? This therefore may seem to be great and temerarious boldness to be so peremptour in it; how many great and horrible wickednesses have been acted, which hath not been visibly pursued with proportionable vengeance, &c. in this world? And thus to determine how much affinity hath it with Enthusiasm, which the Writer hath well confuted in writing against the *Quakers*; and therefore we hope doth not with advertency or deliberation fall into it. We shall only mind you of a much approven and commended saying of *Augustine*, pertinent to this case. *That God doth signally punish some heinous Wickedness; lest men should deny Providence; and forbears to punish as great Wickedness here, that we may expect and certainly conclude there will be a day of Judgment wherein he will render vengeance to such wicked doers.*

I shall add the words of Mr. H. in his excellent Exposition of the Book of *Job* pag. 37. where he is shewing the errors of *Jobs* three Friends, he reckoneth this among those errors, That they maintained, that there was always an actual execution of such Judgments upon all the wicked in this life. But *Job* agreeably to the Scripture, maintained *That God exercises a great variety of dispensations towards wicked men in this life*; Chap. 21. 23, 24, 25. and as may be gathered from the scope of most of his speeches, that oftentimes God seeth it fit to spare wicked men in this life, yea, and to heap prosperity upon them until their death, that so he may exercise the Faith

and Patience of the Godly, and may teach all to look out to a day of Judgment, and the eternal reward of wickedness and piety.

Pag. 115. The Author of the History of the Indulgence, pretends to answer what can be said in the defence of the accepting of the Indulgence. *Having thus shown (saith he) how sinful the accepting of this Indulgence was, upon many accounts, it remains that we remove out of the way what can be said in the defence thereof, to the end we may give all satisfaction possible.*

Ans. If he really intended to give all possible satisfaction, he should not have withholden the state of the question, which in all questions is absolutely necessary, in order to satisfaction.

It's a wonder how he could imagine to give any, let be all satisfaction, or to give any usual ordinary satisfaction; let be all possible satisfaction, and yet withhold from his Readers the state of the question, without which he can give no satisfaction at all; no not the least degree of absolutely necessary satisfaction, which in all controversies, especially about sin and duty, should and must be given; and far less all possible satisfaction, which takes in not only all that must be said, but all that can be said for the Readers satisfaction.

The Authors way of handling this question, will give satisfaction to none, except they be such as are satisfied with ignorance, and confusion, and vain jangling, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. But though there be no candor, yet there is craft in concealing the true state of the Controversie, when the cause is bad,

bad, and cannot stand if it be rightly stated. If this Author had but prefixed the true state of the question to his Reasons against the accepting of the Indulgence, the many accounts upon which he alledges he hath shewn the sinfulness of its acceptance, would have come to no account, and all his showing would have been clearly seen to be nothing but a vain shew. He hath not, nor can any for him shew that those of the outed Ministers, to whom the Magistrate had granted the peaceable publick exercise of their Office in some Parishes, in their returning to those Parishes where they were formerly ordained Ministers, or not having access to the peaceable exercise of their Ministry in their own Parishes, upon the invitation of destitute Congregations, with the consent of Presbyterian Ministers concerned, going to exercise their Office in those destitute Congregations till they might have access to return to their own Parishes; That these Ministers in so doing did sin. Of what Law of God is this practice of theirs a Transgression. Is it a sin for Ministers whom God hath called to the work of the Ministry, to exercise their Office in the Parishes where they were ordained Ministers, or to help destitute Congregations who desire them to come and help them? Is it a sin because the Magistrate permits them to preach? The Author himself dare not say this, as appears from his last Answer to the first Objection. A Minister is not in preaching the Gospel, though an Uppurper, a Robber permit him to preach; and much less doth the Permission of the lawful Magistrate

strate render his preaching sinful.

Object. The Magistrate appoints them to preach, and to preach in such or such a parish; and therefore it's sinful.

Ans. 1. If it were a sin in the Magistrate to appoint a Minister to preach in such or such a place, and a sin for the Minister to preach, because the Magistrate appointed him to preach in such a place, then the Ministers who wrote the first Book of Discipline, and the Church of Scotland who approved it, did sin in desiring the Magistrate to appoint Ministers to preach in such and such Parishes. We did shew from the first Book of Discipline, That they desired the Magistrate to do this and more too, even to compel them to preach.

2. This Author grants in his Answer to the third Objection, *That the Magistrate may place Ministers when the Church is corrupt, and all things are out of order*; the vanity of his evasion by which he seeks to elude that Argument taken from the 10th. Chapter of the second Book of Discipline, is before discovered.

3. Suppose it were unlawful for the Magistrate to appoint a Minister to exercise the Office of the Ministry in a particular Parish; yet it would not be sinful for that Minister to preach in that Parish, if the Parish were vacant, and earnestly desired him to exercise his Ministry among them; and if his preaching there, were not injurious to any; if the Magistrates appointing a Minister to preach, &c. in a Parish, render the Ministers preaching in that Parish sinful, then the Magistrate

strate by such appointments, might make the exercise of the Ministry in any Parish, or in all Parishes in his Dominions, sinful; which is a most absurd Conceit. Or is it sinful to accept of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry in such or such Parishes, because the Magistrate gives them Injunctions and Rules to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry?

But 1. These Injunctions were the Magistrates Acts, and not the Ministers.

2. The Ministers accepted not of these Injunctions, but declared they could receive no such Ecclesiastick Rules from the Magistrate; and that they had full Prescriptions from Christ, which they behoved to observe, as they would be answerable to him of whom they had received their Ministry.

3. The Act of Instructions, as it was distinct from the Act of Indulgence, in which the publick peaceable exercise of their Ministry was granted, and came not to the Ministers hands for a considerable time after they had received the Act of Indulgence; so there was a great difference in the nature of the Acts; and the Indulged Ministers did right in making use of what was good, and refusing what was evil.

4. If the Magistrates sending Injunctions to Ministers, renders the exercise of their Ministry sinful, then the Magistrate may render the exercise of the Ministry in any place, in every place of his Dominions sinful, by sending Instructions to all the Ministers in his Dominions, which is another absurd Conceit; which if it were received, would make it

ease for an ill-disposed Magistrate to mar all preaching by writing and sending Acts of Instructions to all the Ministers in his Dominions.

Object. The Act of Indulgence flowed from a sinful Supremacy, and therefore it was sinful to make any use of it.

Ans. To say nothing of the making use of a Pass given by a Captain of Robbers, or of a Covenant of peaceable commerce made with an Usurper, who hath no just title, which Casuists do not condemn ; I answer, That that Act which indeed was the Act of Indulgence, and which the Indulged Ministers made use of, *viz.* The Relaxation of the Civil Restraint, which hindred the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, or the granting of the publick peaceable exercise of Ministry, was no Act of any sinful Supremacy, but the exercise of that power which the Magistrate hath from God for doing good.

As from the right stating of the question, it evidently appears, That this accepting of the publick peaceable exercise of the Ministry was not sinful ; so it evidently appears, That it was lawful and commendable, and a duty to which they were obliged ; as the work of the Ministry is a good work, so the peaceable settled exercise of it, under the protection of lawful Authority, is a great mercy, that hath many blessings and advantages in it ; it's a promised blessing, it's a blessing for which the people of God should pray ; and because the peaceable settled exercise of the Ministry cannot be where Magistrates are, without their allowance or permission, therefore it's
duty

duty to pray, That the Lord would incline the heart of Rulers to grant the peaceable publick exercise of Religion in their Dominions; and when the Lord inclines the hearts of Ru'ers to this, we should not flight such a promised Mercy, nor refuse the return of our Prayers, but thankfully receive this blessing of God, conveyed by the hand of the Magistrate; and make use of this Talent to the Glory of God, and edification of his Church.

I remember I have spoken before of the advantages of the peaceable settled exercise of the Ministry, and of the necessity of accepting of it, especially in answering the last head of the Authors Arguments; and shall say no more of the state of the question, but this, That they who but understand the terms of the question, will see, that all the Arguments which the Author brings to prove the accepting of the Indulgence sinful, do vanish as smoke, and lose all colour, when they compare before the light of naked Truth. And they will see, that what these Ministers did, in exercising their Ministry in these desolate Congregations, when the Lord in his good Providence had given them peaceable access thereto, was so evidently a religious work, a labour of love, a work of mercy, a reasonable, expedient, necessary work, that they will wonder that any do call the lawfulness thereof in question.

If the Author would have done the part of a Candid Disputant, he should have brought forth all the Arguments made use of by the Indulged Ministers in their full strength; but he brings se-

veral of his own Conceits, which he knew best how to deal with ; and passing the strongest Arguments which were not for his handling, he intermixes with these which he brings, something of his own, which may furnish him occasion of saying something, though nothing to the purpose.

The first Objection as he propones it, runs thus; *May not the Magistrate, for ends known to himself, discharge Ministers to preach for a time, and thereafter permit them to preach? and seeing the business of the Indulgence was but of this nature, why might it not be acquiesced unto?* I wonder how he came to alledge the Magistrates discharging Ministers to preach in this place, as if the discharging to preach were any part of the business of the Indulgence, which was not a discharging to preach, but the just contrary, a permission and allowance to preach? but the Author had something to say concerning the Magistrates discharging of Ministers to preach, that he behoved to say somewhere, but he could hardly have devised a more impertinent place to speak it, than this. The Magistrate should not have hindred these Ministers to preach, he should not have restrained them from preaching, but it was his duty to take off the restraint which he had laid on, and to permit them to preach; this was the exercise of the power which the Magistrate had from God; and therefore the Ministers might lawfully make use of it in accepting this Relaxation of the Restraint formerly laid on, and the peaceable exercise of their Ministry; but if he had formed the Argument thus, he would have had nothing to answer.

His

His first answer is, *That the Indulgence is a far other thing* : It's true, it's a far other thing than the discharging of Ministers to preach, which he impertinently foisted in into the Objection; but, says he, *it's one thing to permit Ministers to exercise their Office without Molestation, and it's a far other thing to appoint and order them to take upon them such or such particular charges*. He does not condemn the Magistrates permitting Ministers to preach, but he hath a quarrel at the Magistrates appointing to take such or such particular Charges, &c. but if he would have dealt fairly with the Magistrate, he should not have foisted in words of his own, but taken the Magistrates words as they are in the Acts of Indulgence, in which they do not say that they appoint and order the Ministers to take upon them such and such particular Charges, but that they appoint them; and in the second Indulgence permit and allow them to preach, and exercise the other parts of the Ministerial Function in such a Parish. If he quarrel at the Magistrates appointing Ministers to preach at such or such Kirks, he must quarrel with the first Book of Discipline, and much more with the second Book of Discipline, which Chap. 10. makes use of the word *placing*; but enough of this before.

But suppose that Appointing were not a proper term, yet he cannot but acknowledge that the Magistrate did in their permitting, allowing, appointing these Ministers to preach at such and such Kirks, really and effectually relax the Civil Restraints formerly laid upon these Ministers,
which

which hindred the peaceable publick exercise of their Ministry in any Parish within the Nation, and freed them from the Molestation which they would have been obnoxious to, in preaching in such or such Parishes before these Acts of Indulgence; and in so far as these Acts did relax that undue Restraint, they were good; this is so evident, that it cannot be with any shadow of Reason denied. And hence I reason thus: When the Magistrate doth right in relaxing undue restraints which hindered the peaceable publick exercise of the Ministry, Ministers may lawfully make use of that Relaxation, but the Magistrate in permitting, allowing, appointing these Ministers to preach in such and such Parishes, did right in relaxing, &c. and therefore these Ministers might lawfully make use of that Relaxation. I would gladly hear an answer to this Argument: What he subjoyns of their plainting and subjecting the Ministry in its exercise to themselves, by giving Injunctions, &c. as he foists in words of his own, which were not in the Acts of Indulgence, so he unreasonably confounds the Act of Instructions with the Act of Indulgence, which were Acts in all respects distinct; the Act of Instructions was no Act of Indulgence; for these Instructions were no Indulgence, but clogs superadded; the Act of Indulgence did take off Restraints; and that the Ministers accepted; the Act of Instructions did lay on Restraints, which the Ministers did not accept of, as was fully manifested before. But this is the ordinary fault of this Author, that when he should reason against the Indulgence,

as it was accepted by the Ministers, or against their pactice in accepting the Relaxation and the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, and the Protection of lawful Authority, he falls to speak of what was wrong in the Magistrates acting, to which the Indulged Ministers had no accession: but ye must excuse him; for if he had not done this, he would have had nothing to say; and yet it had been much better to have said nothing, than to have spoken so impertinently, and so injuriously, in charging the indulged Ministers with the fault that they had no accession to. If the Authors reasonings were reduced to form, they would be very ridiculous; as for example, the Magistrates Act of Instructions which laid on wrong restraints, was not right; and therefore the Magistrates Act of Indulgence which took off wrong Restraints, was not right.

Again, the Magistrate should not have made the Act of Instructions, and therefore the Ministers should not have made use of the Act of Indulgence; *Baculus stat in angulo, ergo pluit*; the Club stands in the Corner, and therefore it rains. This third Argument is as good as the other two; and yet of such Sand-ropes are the Arguings of this Author twisted. Before I leave this, I cannot but suspect, that all that the Author seems to allow to the Magistrate, at least to our Magistrates in reference to the exercise of the Office of the Ministry, is this, That they should permit and not molest Ministers in the exercise of their Office; for he is against their appointing of Ministers to preach at such or such a Kirk; I am
the

the more confirmed in this by some passages of the *Cup of cold Water*, and some late actings; if this be his Opinion, it is a new one: for all Orthodox Divines; and the Church of *Scotland* in the second Book of Discipline, Chap. 1. maintains, That the Civil power should command the Spiritual to exercise; and in that same Chapter it's granted, That the Magistrate ought to command the Ministers to observe the Rule commanded in the word, and punish the Transgressors by civil means; if he ascribe no more to our Magistrates but this, That they should merely permit, or not molest, or as the *Cup of cold Water* hath it, pag. 42. forbear to persecute the Mediators Ambassadors; he gives no more to the Magistrate, than is given to a strong Captain of Robbers, who hath Ministers under his power, and at his disposal, which were most absurd. But even upon this absurd supposition, That the Magistrate might not command, or appoint Ministers to preach; and that appointing were an overstretch, yet even upon this supposition, the Ministers might lawfully after this appointment of the Magistrate, have gone to those Parishes, to which they were appointed to go, upon the earnest desire of those destitute people. I clear it by this similitude: Suppose a Captain of Robbers hath by force subdued an Island, in which there are two Ministers and four distinct Parishes, this Usurper commands these Ministers to be brought before him, and tells them he will not suffer them to return to their former Charges, but appoints them to preach at the two vacant Churches, though

though he have no Authority to appoint them to preach in these two other Parishes, yet these Ministers having no access to their own Parishes, being debarred by strong hand, might upon the earnest desire of the two vacant Congregations, go and help them till they might have regress to their own Parishes; and their doing so, would be no owning of the Authority of the Captain of Robbers to appoint; and it were but folly to say to that Captain, If ye only suffer us to go, it may be we will go; but if ye appoint us, we will not go at all; for that were but the way to hinder themselves from all exercise of their Office, and deprive the whole Island of the benefit of the Gospel; or if that Captain should appoint or command a Physitian to make his residence in such a Town of the Island, or else he would not suffer him to exercise his Calling in the Island; the Physitians going, would be no acknowledgment that the Captain had a lawful Authority to command or appoint him; the exercise of the Ministry and of Medicine, are works of necessity and mercy, and so necessary in order to the Glory of God, and the good of man, that whenever and wherever they who are called and fitted of God to exercise their Offices, have lawful access to do these works of necessity and mercy, they should not neglect the occasion; and it's a Phantastick and Childish Conceit to think, that if men who have no Authority over Ministers or Physitians, or they who have lawful Authority, but claim more in reference to Ministers, &c. than God hath given them;

them; if they take upon them a power in reference to Ministers, which they have not; and in a way not competent to them, appoint Ministers or Physicians to do the work of the Ministry or Medicine, which God (antecedently to any thing that those who usurp upon them, do in reference to them) hath called them to. I say it's a Phantastick and Childish Conceit to think, That such Usurpations can make void the call which they have from God, to do those works of necessity and mercy, when they have access thereunto without doing Injury to any.

His 2, 3, 4. Answers about the Magistrates discharging Ministers to preach, are in answer to what he was pleased impertinently to object to himself; That the Magistrate may for ends known to himself, discharge Ministers to preach; and so though the purpose in his Answers be good, yet they are nothing to the purpose in this place. I have only one question anent somewhat he saith. In the end of his 4th. Answer he grants in the beginning of it, *That the Magistrate may indirectly and consequently silence a Minister for a civil Crime, as Solomon did Abiathar*; but he says, *For an Ecclesiastick Transgression, the Magistrate cannot indirectly or consequently remove any Minister from the exercise of his Ministry, where the Church is settled in his power; except only causative, by commanding the Church-Judicatories to do their work.* First, that is first to judge: for *in prima instantia*, he may not do it; or corroboratively, by backing the Service of the Church-Judicatory with his Civil Sanction and Authority.

Now

Now my question is, Suppose a Magistrate hath commanded a Church-Judicatory to take course with a Minister who preaches Heresie or Doctrine tending to Idolatry, or preaches Schismatick-Doctrine, and rents the Church; and yet the Church-Judicatory through Ignorance or being themselves tainted, or through want of Zeal, take no effectual course to remedy these evils; this is a case supposable: for we see the Church-Judicatory of *Pergamus* suffered them that held the Doctrine of *Balaam*, and that held the Doctrine of the *Nicclarians*, and the Church-Judicatory of *Thyatira*, suffered the Woman *Jezabel*, that called her self a Prophetess, to teach and seduce the Servants of God to commit Fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to Idols; in this case shall the Magistrate do no more but command the Church-Judicatory to their work? He hath done that, and yet the Judicatory does nothing, or nothing to purpose; and the Church is like to be undone through these Doctrines that fret like a Gangreen. And the other member of his distinction makes no help: for the Church-Judicatory, I suppose, passes no right sentence which the Magistrate may corroborate; shall he who is Gods Vicegerent suffer the people of God, and his Subjects, to be poisoned with damnable Doctrine? may he do nothing indirectly to restrain these Hereticks from preaching such damnable Doctrines? and therefore it seems, that though the Magistrate cannot depose an Heretick that's a Minister, yet he may do more to restrain a Heretick from destroying the people of God, than

is

is comprehended within the members of his distinction of causatively and corroboratively; and he himself seems to grant with *Voetius* in his Answer to the second Objection, *That the Magistrate may hinder an Heretick from preaching Heresie either publickly, or from house to house*——

As for his second Objection, if he had formed it thus: When the Magistrate granteth the peaceable publick exercise of the Ministry, Ministers should thankfully accept of this grant, he would have had no Answer; but he kept out peaceable out of the Objection; and then he answers, that the Magistrate should not discharge the publick exercise of the Ministry; well, but what is that to the purpose? will he infer from thence, that therefore he should not allow to Ministers the publick peaceable exercise of their Ministry?

The third Objection he proponeth thus; Our second Book of Discipline granteth, *That Magistrates may place Ministers when the Kirk is corrupted, and all things out of order*; and so it is now with us. The Argument may be framed thus; if the Magistrate when the Church is corrupted, and all things out of order, may place Ministers, then the Magistrate may appoint, permit, allow Ministers to preach in such and such Kirks; For if the Magistrate may do what is more, then they may do what is less in the corrupt state of the Church; But the state of the Church is such: and therefore if the Magistrate may in this case place, &c. he may much more permit, &c. He grants all the major is evident from the place cited; and he grants it to the minor, which was as he pro-

proponed it, but so it is now with us; he answers, that our Church was a constituted and well-ordered Church——but that now Confusion is come, and so in effect he yields all; but I remember he spoke to this before. What he says of the Magistrates bringing on this Confusion, is no evasion; for the Book of Discipline does speak generally of a Church corrupted, whatever way it hath been corrupted, whether by Magistrates or Ministers, that's neither up nor down. A Magistrate that hath disordered the Church; is so much the more obliged to right those disorders; and if a Magistrate hath disordered the Church by thrusting Ministers from the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, he ought to retract what he hath done, by allowing them the peaceable exercise of their Ministry; if he did wrong in thrusting them out, it's right to let them in; and the Church of *Scotland* in that place cited, hath declared, That in that case Ministers should not refuse to preach in any place, because the Magistrate hath interposed his Authority for settling them. He insinuates in the end of this Answer, That this Concession gives the Magistrate all Church-power; but this is a groundless and injurious alledgance; the Authors of that Book, and the General Assemblies, which after exact examination of every part of it, concluded it to be subscribed by every Minister of the Church of *Scotland*, understood the Nature of Church-power much better than he did; and they were so far from thinking, That the Magistrates

who in the corrupt and disordered state of the Church, interposes their Civil Authority for settling Ministers, does in so doing assume unto themselves, and exercise all Church-power ; that they commend what they did in that case as a practice well-becoming godly Kings, and Princes, and Emperors. This Insinuation is highly injurious to those wise and godly men who compiled and approved, subscribed that second Book of Discipline ; for if this Concession did yield all Church-power to the Magistrate, then those who compiled and subscribed it, do quite subvert what they had immediately asserted, *viz.* *That the Magistrate may not usurp any thing which belongs not to the civil Sword, but belongs to the Offices which are meerly Ecclesiastical, as is the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, using Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the Spiritual Execution thereof, or any part of the power of the Spiritual Keys which our Master gave to the Apostles and their Successors:* As it cannot be supposed, that so wise men would so quickly contradict themselves in a Book so deliberately, and after so many Debates concluded ; so it cannot be imagined, that they would design Kings and Princes godly for doing that which would quite swallow up, and subvert the holy Calling of the Ministry.

This one passage in the second Book of Discipline, does quite ruine the cause of the Author of the History of the Indulgence, and approves the practice of the Indulged Ministers ; so that what they have done, they have done it according to the mind of the Church of Scotland

expressed in the second Book of Discipline. The Book says, *That godly Kings both in the old and in the light of the New Testament, have placed Ministers when the Kirk was corrupted, &c.* This not only may be, but it hath been; and the Author denies not that the Church was corrupted at the time of the Indulgence, and all things out of order and in confusion; and thus he really yields the cause, and concedes all; when the Church is corrupted, and all things out of order, the Magistrate may place Ministers, and Ministers may be placed by Magistrates; but at the time of the Indulgence, as the Author grants, the Church was corrupted, and all things out of order; and therefore at the time of the Indulgence, the Magistrate might place Ministers, and Ministers might be placed by Magistrates according to the 10th. Chapter of the second Book of Discipline. It's true, that the Magistrate should not have broken the order of the Church; but to conclude that the Magistrate cannot place Ministers, because he thrusts them out, or that he cannot do them right in granting to them the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, because he did them wrong in restraining them from the exercise of it; or to conclude, That the Magistrate by breaking the order of the Church, loses all Authority to do any good to the Church afterward; or that we may make no use of any good that the Magistrate does, because he hath done evil, or because at the same time he does some things right, and some things wrong, that we cannot chuse the good be.

because we must refuse the evil, is a most unreasonable way of reasoning ; and at this rate a man may conclude *quidlibet ex quolibet* , any thing he pleases from whatsoever he pleases; any Conclusion he pleases from any premisses. Neither doth the acceptance of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry from the Magistrate (who had formerly restrained Ministers by penal Statutes, that they could not without molestation exercise their Ministry) teach Magistrates a way how to usurp all Church-power ; for the taking off of Restraints, was a doing of right, and no Usurpation. He might as well alledge, That if one by strong hand wound a man, and put him out of his own house, and take his Goods, and afterward be willing to cure the wound, and admit the man to return to his House and Goods, that the injured man by admitting the Cure, and returning to his own House and Goods, teaches the man who injured him, to wound, intrude and spoil.

To the 4th. Objection taken from the examples of *Hezekiah* and *Josiah*, who commanded the Priests and Levites to do the work of their Calling, he answers nothing to the purpose. *Hezekiah* and *Josiah* did right in setting the Priests in their Charges, and the Levites in their Courses, and in commanding them to do the work of their Calling ; and if the Priests and Levites did right in obeying those Commands, then Magistrates may not only permit and allow, but also command (when there is need) Ministers to do the work of their Ministerial Calling.

ling, and Ministers may and should obey such Commands; but the former is true, for these Kings are commended for doing so, 2 Chron. 35. 2. &c. 2 Chron. 29. 2, 3, 4, 5. &c. 2 Chron. 31. 2. and therefore the latter is true also.

He answers, *That our Rulers have done many evil things which these Kings did not*; but will he conclude, that because they have done evil which these Kings did not, that therefore they may not imitate these Kings in doing good, in permitting, allowing, commanding Ministers to preach the Gospel, and do the other parts of their Ministerial Office? this was the Act of Indulgence which the Indulged Ministers made use of; and the Magistrate in this Act did not destroy the Order and Beauty of the Church, &c.

The Author in his Answer would make his Reader believe, That they who make use of this Argument, bring it to prove that the Magistrate might make the Act of Instructions; but it hath been often answered, That the Act of Instructions was not the Act of Indulgence; the Act of Indulgence permitted and allowed the exercise of their Ministry; of this Act they made use; the Act of Instructions which was super-added to the Act of Indulgence, the Indulged Ministers did not observe, and told the Magistrate they could not receive such Instructions.

I am wearied of these Repetitions; the Question is, Whether the Magistrate may command Ministers to do the work of their Ministerial Calling? the Question is concluded in the affirmative,

tive, That they may from the Scriptures cited; and if they may command, they may permit and allow them to preach, and do the other Functions of the Ministry. He diverts his Reader from considering the force of the Argument, by making a Comparison betwixt *Hezekiah* and *Josiah*, and other Rulers; as if this were the design of those who argue from the forecited Scriptures, to prove that our Rulers were as godly Reformers as *Hezekiah* and *Josiah*; but this is but a trick to escape the dint of the Argument: As we should mourn, that neither our Rulers nor we, are like those eminently holy Kings, who were very singular for uprightness and tenderness; and pray that the Lord who hath the hearts of Rulers and Subjects in his hand, would give them and us such uprightness and tenderness as those Kings had; so when our Rulers do any thing for which those Kings were commended, we should thankfully acknowledge it; and this is one of those things for which they are commended, That they commanded the Priests and Levites to do their work; and is not preaching and the exercise of the other Functions of the Ministry, the work of the Ministers of the Gospel? and if it was good, and a part of the Reformation of those godly Kings, to command this, why should it be judged evil in our Rulers to do what they did?

Object. 5. But what can be said of such of the Indulged, &c? the Argument may be formed thus; When the Magistrate appoints, permits, allows Ministers to go to their own Charges to ex-

ercise

ercise their Ministerial Office, Ministers may lawfully go, yea, they should go to their own Charges; but the Magistrate appointed those Ministers whom the Objection concerns, to go to their own Charges, to exercise their Ministerial Office, and therefore they might lawfully go, and it was their duty to go.

He answers, 1. *That it was a meer accidental thing that they were sent to their own charges, viz. because at that time they were vacant.*

Ans. 1. He puts in his own word of sending, and not the words used in the Acts of Indulgence, which is not fair dealing.

2. What means he by a meer accidental thing? if he mean that the Council did not intend that they should go to their own Charges, but that this fell out beside the Magistrates intent, this is false; for as it was appointed by the Kings Majesty, That they should return to preach and exercise the other Functions of the Ministry in the Parish-Churches where they formerly served; so the Council appointed them to go to these Churches; and therefore their going thither was not beside the intent of the Magistrate, but was a thing designed and intended by the Magistrate: Their going to their former Charges, was not in respect of the Magistrate, like the finding of a Treasure by a man who is plowing the ground.

But 3ly. Suppose this had been a meer accident, will this militate against these Ministers returning to their own Charges? It was accidental that those Parishes were vacant, and there-

therefore it was unlawful for these Ministers to return to their own vacant Parishes ; had not these Parishes been vacant, these Ministers had been appointed either to go elsewhere, or had not been indulged at all ; and therefore it was unlawful for them to return to those Congregations which were accidentally vacant. These are reasonings which have no shadow of Reason ; but the Subject-matter could not furnish him with any better.

But it would seem from pag. 19. That he opposes accidental, to that which is necessary, and cannot be otherways than it is ; for when he is proving, that this was an accidental thing, he labours to make it appear by Mr. *John Park* his disappointment, because the Prelate prevented his coming to the Kirk designed, by thrusting in a Curate, notwithstanding of his pleading the benefit of the Act of indemnity in his own defence, against what was objected against him, and thereby acknowledged himself to have been a Traytor in all his former actings, and that all the work of Reformation was but Rebellion. Here the Author grants, That Mr. *John Park*'s own Kirk was designed for him, and so his accidental thing is not here opposed to a designed thing, but to a thing that is so necessary, that it cannot be hindred or prevented; and if he take *accidental* in this sense, the Argument must run thus ; The returning of Ministers to their own Charge was not a necessary thing, which must be, and cannot but be ; but only a contingent thing, which may not be, and whose
being

being may be prevented; and therefore it was not a thing lawful, or a duty. But this Argument is as ridiculous, if not more ridiculous than the former; for there are many things which may lawfully be, and should be, which yet never have any existence. I doubt not but the Reverend Brother, Mr. *John Park*, can abundantly clear himself from the foul aspersions that this Author would cast upon him. I know not the Matter of fact, which might yield many grounds of defence; but it seems the Author hath been too intent, to have a hit at Mr. *Park*, seeing he brings, or rather impertinently drags him upon the Stage to be beaten; and that because he pleaded the benefit of an Act of Indemnity. It seems very unreasonable and injurious dealing to alledge, That any man who pleads to have the benefit of an Act of Indemnity as it doth free a man from Skaith and Damage, doth hereby acknowledg, that he hath been a Traytor in all his former actings, or that he acknowledges any real crime at all.

2. Says he, *They were not barely permitted to go to their own Charges by rescinding of the Act of Glasgow, or taking off the Sentence of Banishment; which might easily have been done, if the Council had intended no actual Invasion.*

Ans. They were not barely permitted to return to their own Charges, and therefore they should not have returned. The Council intended an actual Invasion in their returning, and therefore the Ministers sinned in returning. I am
wearièd

wearied in repeating such Arguments that are so palpably absurd.

His 3d. is, *That their right to their former Charges, is nothing but the Councils Order and Appointment.* This is a manifest falshood; the Councils Act gave them access to the peaceable use of the right which they formerly had.

His 4th. *That their case was worse than the case of other indulged Ministers; and that they did renounce their old right to the exercise of their Ministry;* but how proves he that? very easily, viz. by saying it. These things are so absurd and gross, and are so far from having any shadow of Reason, that to repeat them, is to refute them; and the truth is, they are not worthy of repetition, let be of Refutation.

His 5th. *And why may they not also repair to Presbyteries and Synods, upon the Councils order? &c.*

Ans. If the Magistrate would set up Presbyterian Government by Presbyteries and Synods, would he have Ministers refuse to go to these Presbyteries and Synods? if he mean Presbyteries and Synods Prelatically constitute, in which the Prelatick Power is exercised, and they who constitute themselves Members of these Courts, own the Prelatick Power which gives them their being; his Question is impertinent; for there is a great disparity betwixt a Ministers going to a Court Prelatically constituted, and going to preach to his own Parish. The Magistrates discharge doth not invalidate the right that Ministers have to meet in Presbyteries and Synods; but it hinders the peaceable use of that right.

The

The 6th. Object. He propones thus ; If it be a ground sufficient to reject the benefits of the Indulgence, because it is supposed to flow from the Supremacy; then much more more might we refuse to preach if the Magistrate should command it expressly by virtue of his Supremacy; and if this be yielded, then it is manifest, that if the Magistrate had a mind to banish all preaching out of his Dominions, he needeth use no other medium than only tell the Ministers, That he commanded them to preach by virtue of his Supremacy. This is a piece of one of the Arguments made use of by the Indulged Ministers: it may be formed thus ; If the Ministers of the Gospel may not lawfully preach the Gospel in any place where the Magistrate who claims to himself a Spiritual Supremacy, appoints or permits them to preach ; and if Ministers may not lawfully preach the Gospel, if Magistrates command them, by virtue of their Spiritual Supremacy, to preach it, and write Ecclesiastical Instructions and Injunctions to regulate them ; then the Magistrate may, if he be so disposed, easily banish all preaching out of his Dominions, by writing Papers, in which he claims the said Supremacy, and sets down Injunctions, &c. But this latter is most absurd ; and therefore so is the former; the absurdity of this, that the Magistrate by his claiming to himself a Spiritual Supremacy, and giving Instructions to Ministers, which is his proper deed, which the Ministers cannot hinder, and to which they have no accession, can make Ministers preaching unlawful ; I say, the absurdity of this conceit is so evident, that any who have com-
mon

mon sense, and will make use of it, may clearly perceive it. Now let us hear what he answers :

1. He says, *That he hath seen and manifested, that the Indulgence hath a real relation to, and dependance upon the Supremacy.*

Ans. He hath never manifested, That the Indulgence, as it was accepted, hath any such dependence upon any unlawful Supremacy ; or that the Magistrates Acts, which were indeed the Acts of Indulgence, *viz.* his appointing, permitting, allowing Ministers of the Gospel to preach the Gospel, flow from any unlawful Supremacy.

2. He says, *That he hath adduced many other heads of Arguments against it.*

Ans. These many heads are cut off in the answers before adduced.

In his 3d. he grants , *That the command to preach simply, cannot be said to flow from, nor to have such a dependance upon this usurped Supremacy ; for to command Ministers to do their duty in preaching the Gospel according to the Command of God, belongs to the Power which God hath granted to the Magistrate , and so natively floweth from his Office.* Now seeing the Author hath granted this, I hope he will no more quarrel at the indulgence upon the account of the Magistrates using the word appointing Ministers to preach ; for commanding is at least as much as appointing. He adds, *But to set down Limitations, Restrictions and Conditions, regulating the exercise of the Ministry, doth not so flow ; and when they are such as are opposite to the Rules of Christ , it must of necessity be by virtue of an usurped power ; whence it is apparent,*

parent, *That this Indulgence, containing such limitations, &c. doth not flow from the Office of the Christian Magistrate, &c.*

Ans. It hath been often answered, That the Act of Instructions was an Act distinct from the Act of Indulgence; and the Ministers did never accept the Instructions, and gave Reasons to the Magistrate why they could accept of no such Instructions, as was shewed before. He adds, *Therefore though in the case of simple preaching, the Injunction ushered in with an express mention of the Supremacy, as it's ground and rise, would be but a ridiculous Scarcrow; yet in this other case, which is the case of the Indulgence, it would be an open spreading of the Net in the sight of the Bird, and more than a sufficient warning for wise men to beware.*

Ans. If the Supremacy set before the Injunction to preach the Gospel, be but a ridiculous Scarcrow, that should not hinder Ministers from preaching it; then certainly the Act of Instructions which was set behind the Injunction to preach the Gospel, is as ridiculous a Scarcrow, and should hinder no Minister from doing the work of the Ministry; yea, it seems more ridiculous: for the Scarcrow of the Supremacy is by the Author supposed to be before the Injunction of preaching; but this Scarcrow of the Instructions comes behind the injunction of preaching. Now those Scarcrows which are betwixt Crows and the Corn, scars them more than those Scarcrows which are beyond the Corn. And if Ministers need not scar at the Injunction of preach-

preaching, though the Magistrate wrapt in his Supremacy in the Injunction, then Ministers need far less fear at any Injunction to preach the Gospel, because there is another Act of Instructions lying at some distance from it; for if judicious Ministers may and should make use of the good injunction to preach the Gospel, though the Magistrate did endeavour to wrap his Spiritual Supremacy in it; if they may untwist his Act, and take the Injunction, and leave his Spiritual Supremacy, as having nothing to do with it; I am sure they may far more easily take the Injunction to preach, and leave the Act of Instructions, which is not twisted in with it; but as it was distinct in it's Nature, so it lay at a pretty distance from it; but, says he, *this is an open spreading of the Net in the sight of the Bird.*

Ans. 1. The more open it be, there is the less hazard, except men be more silly than Birds, who do not use to intangle themselves in a Net that's openly spread in their sight; and therefore crafty Fowlers use to hide their Snares.

2. The Supremacy which he supposes to be wrapped in with the Injunction to preach, is as open a Snare; and if folk would be scarred without Reason, they would have a fairer pretence for making no use of an Injunction to preach, ushered in with, and founded upon a Spiritual Supremacy; than for making no use of an Injunction to preach, because of another Act of Injunction, which, as it hath no connexion in nature with the Injunction to preach, so it hath not so much as a connexion in the Contexture of the

the Magistrates Act, being framed in a distinct Act. He adds, *This is more than a sufficient warning for Wise men to beware.*

Ans. But of what? I hope not of preaching the Gospel; and yet he must say this, or he says nothing to the purpose here; for if he mean of the Instructions, this makes no difference betwixt this case and the former; for so must Ministers beware of the Spiritual Supremacy, by which the Injunction of preaching is ushered in; but yet the Author would not have Ministers scaring at preaching, because of the Supremacy; no more should they beware of preaching, because of the Instructions.

In his 4th. he says, *Though a command to preach according to the Rules of Christ, cannot be accounted to flow from this corrupt Supremacy, even though the Magistrate shall say so much in plain terms; yet a command to preach in this place, and not in another place; and to preach so and so according to such Limitations, Rules and Prescriptions, and according to no other, as it is in the case of Indulgence, may be said to flow natively from the corrupt Supremacy*—And so he infers the accepting of the Indulgence cannot be justified, though in the granting of it, no mention was made of the Supremacy, much less if this were expressly prefixed.

Ans. 1. As to the matter of fact, the Author misrepresents the Magistrates Act of Indulgence; for though the Magistrates appointed, permitted, allowed the Ministers to preach in such places, yet they did not command them to preach in no other place. Again, though they gave
Li-

Limitations and Prescriptions, yet they never limit the Ministers so to these Prescriptions, as to exclude all other Prescriptions. Seeing he had a mind to make such terrible Amplifications, he did not wittily in setting down the Acts of Indulgence, which are a sufficient refutation of those additions which he hath made to them. If any alledge, that the Magistrate confined them, and that restrained them from preaching in any other place; the Author answereth, p. 116. *That the Magistrate by banishing and confining, may consequently and indirectly silence Ministers, as Solomon removed Abiathar from the Priesthood.* Now this was a worse confinement than that of the Indulged Ministers in this respect, because Abiathar could not exercise the Priests Office but at *Jerusalem*, from which *Solomon* banisht him; but the Indulged Ministers not only might, but they might without hazard, preach in the Parishes to which they were confined; but though he grant this, yet he denieth that the Magistrate can directly discharge Ministers to preach; and therefore the Act of Confinement will not warrant what he says here, That the Magistrate commanded them to preach in one place, and not in another; if they preach in another place beside that to which they are indulged, they run a hazard; but the Magistrate hath not in the Act of Indulgence directly discharged them to preach in another place.

2. He cannot prove, That the Magistrate commanding a Minister to preach in a certain place, is an Act of Erastianism, or an Act that

flow

floweth from a corrupt Supremacy ; yea, he hath granted, according to the tenth Chapter of the second Book of Discipline, That the Magistrate may in some cases place Ministers; the Ministers who went to their own Parishes had the antecedent Judgment of the Church at their Ordination, for preaching in such Churches, and the Magistrate in appointing them to go thither, appointed them to do what the Presbytery had before ordained them to ; they who went to other Churches than their own, as they had the antecedent Judgment of the Church of *Scotland* in that tenth Chapter of the second Book of Discipline, to warrant their Act ; so before they went to the Council, they had the advice of, or consent of the generality of the outed Ministers to do what they did ; and before they went to these Parishes, they had Invitations from the respective Congregations.

3. As for the Instructions, enough hath been said before ; they were not the Act of Indulgence which the Ministers made use of ; and therefore whatever be the fountain whence they flowed, the Indulged Ministers are not defiled, seeing they drank not of those streams.

But 4ly. The Author hath forgot the Argument which he should have answered ; he doth not evite the absurdity of the banishing all preaching out of the Land, mentioned in the end of the Objection he proposed ; And therefore I shall again resume it ; for suppose that it were not only unlawful for Magistrates to give Instructions, but also to appoint or permit Mi-

nisters to preach in certain places, that will not make it unlawful for Ministers whom they appoint to preach in such places, to preach there, suppose the Instructions be superadded : for if this should follow, then the Magistrate, if he were ill-disposed, and would render Ministers ridiculous, he might banish all preaching, by ordering Clerks to write Papers, and send to these Ministers ; for wherever they should or would preach, or people would hear them, he might send his Commands to them to preach there, and his Instructions to regulate them ; and then forsooth it would be unlawful for them to preach in that place ; or if he would not have them to preach in the Fields, he might hinder them by commanding them to preach in the Fields, and sending Instructions to them ; and if he would have them preaching in plain open Fields where Soldies, horse and foot, might win at them, he might command them to preach in flow-mosses, and particularly design the mosses in such and such Shires, and then all preaching in these mosses would become unlawful, and so people behoved either to have no preaching, or come to the plain open Fields where the Soldiers might easily take or kill them ; and thus they would not only lose preaching, &c. but also render themselves ridiculous.

In his 5th. he says, *The visible ends of Magistrates in giving forth of Commands which may be known by several circumstances, may do much to clear and determine Christians to obey or not obey ; and so a Command materially the same, may in*
some

some cases be obeyed, in some cases not ; so that when the Magistrate manifesting his intent to root out the Gospel, shall command all Ministers by virtue of an usurped Supremacy, to preach the Gospel, the material Commands may be obeyed, and yet the Magistrate frustrate in his Intentions. But when he commands a few, and only a few by virtue of his Supremacy to preach here or there, as he pleaseth, and upon such terms as he is pleased to prescribe, and under such and such Limitations and Restrictions as he is pleased to enjoin to the manifest hurt and detriment of the Kingdom of Christ, he is to be disobeyed and frustrate of his pernicious ends ; whence we see how different the cases are.

Ans. Yes, the cases are different, as ye have made them, because in the first case where all Ministers are commanded to preach, ye held out the Limitations and Restrictions ; but in the second case, where a few Ministers are commanded to preach, ye put in the Restrictions and Limitations ; and thus ye make an unequal and iniquitous comparison. But first, to leave Christians to determine and clear themselves from the visible ends of Magistrates, which again are to be known from several Circumstances, looks rather like the Advice of a Politician, than the solid advice of a Divine to honest simple Christians. The like of these resolves, puts honest simple people from the plain Rules given in the word of God for directing their actions, to take their measures from Magistrates and Statesmens intentions and ends ; and because Statesmens ends are seldom visible when they think in

their interest to conceal them ; so when they please, they can give out designs which they do not really intend ; and can order circumstances so, as to give a fair colour to these pretended designs ; and is not this a pitiful Directory for plain honest Christians ? I would not have noticed this, if I had not heard it regrated by many, that by Directions of this kind, simple people are brought to intangle themselves in the intreigues of State, and to guess at the designs of State-men, and to counterwork the designs which they guess the Magistrate hath against them ; and thus while they should be conferring upon the word of God, upon the chief end of man, and the means that leads to that end, they waste their time in guessing at the Magistrates ends, and in setting the World upon Stoups, and parts more foolish and confused than when they met.

2. He grants in the first case, *That the Magistrates Intention is to root out the Gospel; though it be manifested by him, should not hinder the Ministers from obeying the Magistrates Command to preach.* This Concession overturns all his former reasonings from the Magistrates bad intentions ; for if this be true, that when the thing commanded by the Magistrate is good, it may be done though the Magistrate command it by virtue of an usurped Supremacy, and command it for an ill end, viz. the rooting out of the Gospel ; then the Magistrates assumed Supremacy by which he commands, and his evil design for which he commands the preaching of

of the Gospel does not vitiate the Ministers preaching of the Gospel ; and thus a great part of his Book is by his own concession evanished in smoke, and all the Batteries he hath raised against the Indulged Ministers upon these grounds of the Magistrates Spiritual Supremacy, and evil designs, hath been a building of Castles in the Air ; and hence it appears, That the bad circumstances of the Magistrates actings, in permitting, allowing, commanding Ministers to preach the Gospel, does not vitiate the Ministers preaching of the Gospel ; who as they do not approve of what is wrong in the Magistrates acting, nor have any accession to the wrong Principles and ends of the Magistrate ; so they preach the Gospel upon right Principles, and for right ends.

I see the Author can allow Ministers in some cases to abstract good from evil, to obey what is good in the Magistrates command, and leave what is evil in the Principles upon which, and the end for which he commands ; why did he then gybe at the Indulged Ministers for making such Metaphysical abstractions, as if they had not been manly, or such as became honest men and Ministers ? but now he himself hath spoilt all the sport that was in these gybings ; and as he hath exposed himself to laughter, alledging that metaphysical abstractions, which are one of the things which distinguishes men from Beasts, are not manly ; so he hath made himself obnoxious to just Censure, in alledging, That the Indulged Ministers abstraction in the foresaid case, was not honest nor suitable to Ministers of the

Gospel; and yet granting that honest ministers may make such abstractions.

3. I argue from his Concession, If all the Ministers in the Magistrates Dominions may obey the Magistrates Command to preach, though it be ushered in with an usurped Supremacy, and designed for an ill end; then some of these Ministers may do what all of them might have done; for few, as well as many, may chuse the good and leave the ill; why should the preaching of the Gospel be sinful to a few Ministers, if it be lawful to all? what if the Magistrates had commanded all the Ministers that were ordered, to preach, except one or two, would it have been sinful to them to preach so long as these two were excepted. I suppose no sober person will say so, and yet the deduction of these two, mars the Universality; for if two be excepted, then all are not commanded to preach; suppose the total sum of these Ministers were 40, shall the Magistrate excepting or passing by 2, or 10, or 20, or 30 of the 40, render it unlawful to the 38, or 30, or 20, or 10, whom he indulges, to preach? if the passing by of two makes it not unlawful for the 38 to preach, why should the passing by of 10, or 20, &c. render it unlawful to the rest to preach? must the sinfulness or unlawfulness of preaching be calculated by Arithmetick figures? This is a new use of Arithmetick, that I suppose *Marcbeston* himself never imagined. If the accepting of one or two, does not make it sinful for the rest to preach when the Magistrate commands them, would

would know if the exception of 4 or 8, will render it unlawful to the rest to preach? and if not, where shall we list? what is the number that will alter the morality of preaching, and turn what was right, to be wrong? who can determine the *maximum quod sic*, or the *minimum quod sic*, the precise number *quo non datur ultra*? but enough of this.

4. What he adds to make the case of the few different from the case of all, *viz.* That the few are commanded to preach here and there, and Limitations and Restrictions superadded to the Command, should have been added in the first case, if he would have dealt fairly, and to have encountered the Argument in its full strength; but he framed the first supposed case so, as he might make a way for himself to escape; but he must not go so. I shall therefore reinforce the Argument thus. If it be unlawful for all the Ministers, or all the outed Ministers in a Kingdom, to preach the Gospel, if the Magistrate by virtue of an usurped Supremacy, and for an ill end, command them to preach here and there and under such and such Limitations and Restrictions; then a Magistrate by such a Command without any more ado, may banish all preaching out of his Dominions; but the latter is absurd, and so is the former. I see not how upon his Principles this absurdity can be evited; for if a few Ministers may not lawfully preach, if they be so commanded and restricted, how can many preach lawfully, if so commanded and restricted? but ye will say, there is a great difference betwixt many and few; I grant there is an Arithmetical difference,

but it's nothing to the present purpose; for if the Restrictions do vitiate the preaching of a few, it will also vitiate the preaching of many; for moral filth is not like natural filth, diminished by spreading, but is rather encreased. If it be said, That, if all Ministers were so commanded to preach, they might frustrate the Magistrates ill Intentions, and sinful Instructions, by driving on the great design of the Gospel, and observing Christs Instructions. I answer; A few of them might do the same; what should hinder a few of them to do what all may do?

5. If a small number may not lawfully preach if there were such restrictions superadded to the command of preaching, then it were still easie for the Magistrate to put all from preaching, by writing such and such Restrictions; for it would take but a little more time to do it; for first he might send his command to preach, and his Instructions to a few; and they might not lawfully preach, because they were but a few; and when they are laid by, he sends his command to preach with Instructions to another small number of them, and so on, till he had put all of them from preaching; for many smalls will amount to All be-time.

In his 6th. he grants, *That when that which the Magistrate commands by virtue of his Supremacy, is not only lawful, but necessary by virtue of a Command of God; the prefixing of the Supremacy cannot alter the nature of the Duty.* He might have added, *That the affixing of the Restrictions can no more alter the nature of a Duty.*

Duty than the prefixing of the Supremacy can alter it; but he adds, *That he hath above cleared, that what was done by the indulged Ministers, was neither expedient nor lawful*; but he hath never cleared it, but it hath been cleared, that what the indulged Ministers did in preaching in the places to which they were indulged, was lawful, expedient, and in many respects necessary.

In his 7th. he grants, *If this supposed command came to Ministers already preaching, the Supremacy might be sufficiently delete by a Protestation or Declaration, that they preach by virtue of Christs Supremacy*; but if it were given to *cuted Ministers detained from their work till they should thus acknowledge the unlawful Supremacy of the Magistrate, He supposes there might be ground here for a demur.*

Ans. I do not understand what this thus acknowledging means, or this *thus* relates to; I doubt if he could well explicate this; if he thinks that the preaching of these outed Ministers would be an acknowledging of that unlawful Supremacy, why should not the preaching of the already settled Ministers be so too? Why might not a Declaration salve all in the Ministers that were out, as well as in these who were in? If this were an acknowledging of the unlawful Supremacy, I wonder why he should be in any demur. The Argument I perceive hath strangely puzzled him. If he be not positive, that a command to which the unlawful Supremacy is prefixed, should be refused, why is he so positive, that a command to preach should be quite refused

fused because of Instructions superadded in another Act; I can see no shadow of Reason for this: now he is far from being Peremptour in the former case, but very, very modest; *I suppose*, says he, *there might be ground here for a demur*; he does not positively assert, That they should refuse to preach in this case, but he only supposes; not that there was actually, but that there might be ground; not for a refusal, but only for a demur. I wish he had pondered his Argument in its full strength; it's like it would have put him in a demur as to the writing of this History, and spared him a great deal of needless labour, and much waste of his precious time, which might have been improven to the good of the Church and his own edification. I leave him in this demur, and come to the 7th. Objection, which he proposeth in this question. It seemeth then you would not be for Ministers returning to their own charges, if the Magistrate should grant such an order or permission; he who will not be for a Ministers doing his duty, is wilful without and against Reason; but he who will not be for a Ministers returning to his own Charge, will not be for a Ministers doing his duty; and therefore he is wilful without and against Reason.

In his first he grants, *That though the Order or Permission did expressly mention the Supremacy, as it's ground, that yet it might be made use of with a Protestation.*

1. I see the Author in this case, would not scar at the Magistrates ordering; and why then makes

makes he such a business about the word *appointing*?

2. *That their returning to their own Charges, though the Magistrate order it, is not a renouncing of their former mission and old right, nor a renouncing of their dependence upon Christ, nor a deriving of their Ministry from the Magistrate; for if it were such, the matter could not be salved by a Protestation.* This Concession overturns a great part of his Book.

3. There was no mention made of the Supremacy at all in the Indulgence; and therefore there was no need by his own Concession of such a Protestation.

4. Though there had been mention of it, Ministers returning to their own Charges, would have been, according to this Concession, but a seeming Homologation of the sinful usurpation.

In his 2d. he thinks, if the permission were not universal, but a permission of some only, that then they should not go; and why? because the Magistrates intention to divide, is manifest; suppose that to be true, yet the Ministers returning to their own Charge, hath no tendency to division. If men must not do their duty because they who permit them to do it, have ill Designs, this would be a new device for torturing mens Consciences, and would make Ministers as dependent upon the Magistrates intention, as to the lawfulness of their ministerial actings, as the Papists are dependent upon the Priests intention, as to the validity of their Sacraments. If a Minister should not go to his own Charge, because

cause the Magistrate hath an ill design in permitting him, by the same reason a Prisoner should not go home to his Wife and Children, because the Magistrate hath an ill design in letting him go home. He says, *This is contrary to our Covenants*; it's strange how any man could imagine, that Ministers going to their places and stations, could be contrary to the Covenant, which supposeth that every man should keep him within the bounds of place, station and vocation; such wild conceits tend to render the Covenants ridiculous. He grants that the Ministers permitted, would be freed from trouble, and the Congregations receive some advantage; yet the publick good of the Church would be prejudged; but what advantage could Congregations receive from them if that were true, that they were not the Ministers of Christ, but of men, &c? He destroys what he had formerly builded; but he does well in casting down what he had sinfully builded. The publick good of the Church is not to be measured by any particular mans phantasie; and Ministers must not leave their stations, or refuse to go to them, because this or that particular person judges that the Church is prejudged by their so doing; and their returning to their own Charges, does no way tend to confirm the Magistrate in usurpations or encroachments, but to confirm him in doing his duty, in setting Ministers in their Charges, as *Josiah* set the Priests in their Charges, 2 Chron. 35. 2.

In his 3d. he thinks, *That the Ministers should not go to their own Charges, if they were confined,*
though

though the liberty were granted to them all, because of the ill design of the Magistrate; and many inconveniencies that would follow. We have spoken enough of the Magistrates intention. The inconveniencies do no way urge the indulged Ministers, who never promised to keep their confinement. Their returning to their proper Charges does not incapacitate them for preaching elsewhere; they may with hazard after their returning, preach elsewhere, if it be found necessary by those to whom it is competent to determine matters of that nature. If his reasons conclude, they will not only conclude, That outed Ministers should not return to their Charges; but that though they had not been outed, they should have outed themselves to preach in other Congregations where there was so great ignorance, &c. If a corruption of a great part of the Land be a good reason for Ministers not fixing, then how comes it, that the Apostles fixed Ministers, when the whole World almost was corrupt with Paganism? and it's loose work to loose every one, and let them go and preach where they list.

In his 4th. he says, *Though this liberty were without confinement, yet if any one or other of those Prescriptions were added, with which the indulgence was clogged, that the liberty could not be accepted, for the reasons against the indulgence would militate against that liberty.* But may not rational men make use of a grant of due liberty, and yet not take on clogs? The Magistrates making clogs, does not clog them, except they take on the

the clogs ; may not a man return to his own house to do the Duty of the Master of a Family, though the Magistrate prescribe Injunctions to him, which he cannot in Conscience obey? We have seen the vanity of his militating Reasons, which fight against the wind, and conclude nothing against the indulged Ministers.

In his 5th. he says, *That though the grant of liberty were Universal, and without intanglements, and grounds of scrupling, that he leaves it to Christian Prudence to consider, whether, as matters now stand, the Lord be not rather calling them to preach his Name on the mountains, seeing that way hath been so blessed, and Adversaries are not really repenting, and that such a Permission could not flow from good, but ill Principles.* I remember, I have answered to this before, and shewed the vanity of these Reasons ; and hence it appears, that his design is to put Ministers and people in a State of Hostility with the Magistrate ; he is not for receiving from them, according to the dictates of the Author of the *Cup of cold Water* ; but enough of this before. I hope no judicious person will imagine, that such wild conceits, viz. *That it's unlawful for Ministers to settle in any particular Charge, when a great part of the Land is prejudged against the work of God, that the peaceable exercise of the Ministry granted by the lawful Magistrate, is to be refused, if the Magistrate be not a real Penitent, and if he have not gracious Principles and good designs in granting that which he ought to grant ;* If say, I hope that no judicious person will imagine, that because the Author is designed a Presbyterian

rian in the Title-page, that these and the like Conceits scattered through the History, are the opinions of Presbyterians.

The 8th. Objection may be thus proponed; The peaceable, safe exercise of the ministry granted by the Magistrate, is a mercy promised by the Lord, and of great import to Souls, &c. and therefore it should not be rejected but accepted. What he answers, *That the Gospel may be preached, though the Magistrate grant not the peaceable exercise of preaching, as it was by Christ and the Apostles*, is true; but it is nothing to the purpose: he should have shewed, That Christ or his Apostles refused the Magistrates Permission to preach when it was granted. *Paul* was so far from rejecting such a grant, that he intreats for it, *Act. 21. 39. I beseech thee suffer me to speak unto the people.* 2. He would make the world believe, That the outed Ministers had left their Charges out of a Principle of reasonless fear, and were like *Solomens* Sluggard, who imagines a Lyon to be there, where Lyons use not to be; Lyons use not to haunt Ways and Streets: but the hazard of those Ministers was not feigned; they did not fear where no fear was; he should have remembered how this Lyon frightened himself so far, that in his fear he engaged to put the broad Sea betwixt him and that Lyon. He says, *The Gospel might have been preached without this Indulgence, though with less ease, peace and quietness to the Preachers and Hearers; yet he is sure with more inward quietness of mind, and acceptance with God, and with more ground of hope of a rich Blessing to follow*

follow their pains, as experience hath proven.

Ans. 1. These are his own imaginations. 2. Experience hath not proven that they who have rejected the peaceable exercise of their ministry, when they might have had it in a lawful way, have had more success in preaching, or more inward peace in chusing a way of preaching, that exposed them to molestation, than they would have had, if they had embraced the peaceable exercise of their ministry. Indulged Ministers could not have peace and quiet in their minds to reject the offer of the peaceable exercise of their ministry. And the assurance of this Author, That they would have had more quietness in refusing than in chusing the peaceable exercise of their ministry, is no evidence to the contrary: this is no Demonstration. The Author of the History of the Indulgence was sure, that the indulged Ministers would have more peace and success in refusing, than in embracing the peaceable exercise of their ministry; and therefore they should have refused it; the indulged Ministers must have better surety for the consequence, than his assurance.

The 9th Object. is very confusedly proponed, and as confusedly answered, *interrogativis danda sunt debita responsiva*. I have some other thing to do, than to be his Interpreter in unravelling such ravelled Discourses; any thing that he says in his Answer against the indulged Ministers, hath been frequently refuted.

He answers to the 10th. Objection, by saying, *That we saw that by the Indulgence, there was an*

express Deputation, &c. He hath a faculty of seeing that which is not really visible, *vitium est in organo*, we are not obliged to see with his eyes which were vitiate with an ill humour. The indulged Ministers were lawfully settled in their respective Charges, as hath been often cleared.

He hath vitiate the 11th. Argument by foisting in it one of his own Imagination, That the relaxation of the Restraint formerly laid on, was sinful upon the Granters part, which is a notorious falshood; for it was the Magistrates Duty to grant such a Relaxation. After several Discourses which are not to the purpose, he grants in his 5th. Answer, *That after an Universal overthrow of the Priviledges of the Church, we may lawfully accept of little, when more cannot be had*; and so he yields the Cause, and undoes what he hath been formerly doing. What he adds, That that little must be such as was not unlawful at any time to be accepted of; and that we must accept it in another manner than could ever have been accounted a sinful compliance, is no evasion for him; for the Relaxation was lawful in its self; and the manner of acceptance was no sinful compliance, and could never truly be accounted sinful.

To his 6th. I answer, That the peaceable liberty of publick preaching cannot be had without the Magistrate; and until he prove, that the peaceable exercise of the Ministry is a needless thing, and the Relaxation or the Grant of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, an Usurpation; he cannot prove the Acceptance of that

Relaxation to be a needless compliance with, or a Confirmation of any Usurpation.

In the 12. Objection he hath foisted in one of his own suppositions, *That the Relaxation* (so often mentioned before) *was an insufferable imposition*, which is manifestly false; If there was any defect in the Ministers when they were at first turned out, the Author of this History was as defective as his Neighbours. By resisting unto blood, I suppose he does not mean, that Ministers should have continued preaching in their own Pulpits, till they had been killed in them; our Saviour allows Ministers, when they are persecuted in one City, to flee to another; he did not himself continue preaching at *Rotterdam* after he was commanded by the Magistrate to remove, till his Blood was shed. The indulged Ministers accepting of a part of what was formerly taken from them, is not a parting with a hoof, nor doth it put them in any incapacity to use any lawful means in their places and stations for recovering former privileges.

He supposes in the 13th. Objection, That the Magistrates principal Design in this matter, was the establishment of his own Supremacy; but how can that be proven, That the Magistrate in granting the safety of the exercise of the Ministry, did intend the establishment of any sinful Supremacy? this cannot be proven from the Magistrates Act of Relaxation; for this was an Act of that Authority which is of God, an Act of lawful Civil power;

if

if this Act have no tendency to such an intent, how can he conclude, that this was confessed by the Magistrates Design? for the Magistrate hath not by deed or word confessed it; but the Author, like some others, concludes many things by guessing; they lay Foundations by guess, and build up conjectural Superstructures upon these conjectural Foundations. But suppose the Magistrate had such a Design, this could no way vitiate the practice of the indulged Ministers, as hath been frequently manifested.

The 14th. Argument may be proposed thus; When the Magistrate grants to Ministers the peaceable exercise of the ministry in one Act, and in another Act, by way of command, and not by way of paction, superadds Instructions, which those Ministers cannot observe; if these Ministers accept of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, and not only observe not the Instructions, but also declare to the Magistrate, That they cannot receive such Instructions; these Ministers do their duty in chusing what is good, and refusing what is evil; but the indulged Ministers did so, and therefore they did what was their Duty.

He answers, 1. *That though the Magistrate thought it below them to act any otherways than by way of command; yet the nature of the thing saith, That the accepting of the first, doth virtually engage to the second; both making up one complex grant, or one Indulgence so qualified.*

I reply, 1. That he knew by experience, that the Magistrate can come so low, as to require

consent by Subscription; but the Magistrate did not require of the indulged Ministers to promise either by word or writ to observe these Instructions.

2. I perceive when the Author knows not what to answer, he alledges, That the nature of the thing says what he would say; but neither the nature of this thing, nor the nature of any other thing says, That the accepting of good, doth virtually engage to the accepting of evil; nor doth Nature say, That the Act of Instructions was an Act of Indulgence; it being a gravaminous Act; now an Act imposing things that are grievous, is not an Act of Indulgence, nor doth nature say, that these two Acts are one Act; for though they were made by the same Magistrate, for the same Ministers; yet they were different Acts, and as distinct in their natures, as good and evil are; and the Ministers did wisely distinguish them one from another, in accepting the one, and giving Reasons why they could not receive the other.

2. He says, *Though the Council did not call for any formal or express engagements from them unto the performance of these Injunctions, yet their carriage to Mr. Blair upon his renouncing of these Injunctions, sheweth, that they meant those Instructions for Conditions; this also they declared in their after-Proclamations.* I answer, If the Injunctions, as he grants, were not at first given as Conditions by way of paction, seeing the Council did not call for any engagement from the Ministers to the performance of these In-

Injunctions, no After-acts of the Council could turn what the Council had long before acted by way of command, into a pactional transaction; if the After-act of any person or Society could turn their own Commands, or Directions given to others, into Pactions, without the consent of those to whom such Commands or Directions were given, it would make a strange reel in the World, and men should thus be involved by Paction to perform Conditions, though they never consented, yea, though they declared they did not, nor could not consent.

2. Although the Council had shewed by their imprisoning of Mr. *Blair*, that they meant those Injunctions for Conditions, that being so long after the Indulgence, it could no way constitute the nature of the Indulgence, which had its being and existence long before.

3. The meaning of one Party, though shewed, will not make a Paction, except the other party consent.

4. The Author grants, That Mr. *H.* spoke the same upon the matter that Mr. *Blair* did; and so did several others who were before the Council at that time; and the Magistrate, as I am readily informed, said, That it was some circumstances of what was done by Mr. *Blair*, that occasioned his imprisonment.

But 5ly. Suppose he had been only imprisoned upon that account, because he would not receive those Injunctions; that will not prove, that the Magistrate did mean them for

Conditions; for the Magistrate often imprisoneth men for disobeying Acts of Council, though the persons imprisoned have made no promise to obey those Acts; and though the Injunctions which they obey not, were never meant by the Council for Conditions.

6. Suppose the Magistrate had in the very Acts of Indulgence, signified that they had meant those Injunctions for Conditions; and had put in those Injunctions as Conditions in the Acts of Indulgence. I do not see how this would have rendred their ministerial actings in the Parishes to which they were indulged unlawful, nor rendred those Ministers any ways guilty, providing that they had no ways consented unto those Injunctions. Suppose *Pharaoh* had granted liberty to the Midwives to do their Office to the travelling *Hebrew Women*, upon condition that they should kill the Male-Children; this should not have barred the Midwives from that work of mercy towards the *Hebrew-Women* in Child-birth; and if the Midwives had no way consented to this Condition, they would have no ways been guilty of any sin; though necessary Duties be clogged with sinful Injunctions imposed by men, they should not be omitted; but the Duties should be done, and the sinful Injunctions disobeyed. And suppose the Midwives knew that *Pharaoh* would have restrained them from doing that Labour of Love, that work of necessity and mercy to the Labouring Women; if they had foretold, that they would not kill the Male-Children, I think they

they did better to hold their Tongue, than to put themselves out of a capacity to do so needful a Duty to the Travailing-Women; but there is no need of this for vindicating the practice of the indulged Ministers, because they declared to the Magistrate, *That they had received full Prescriptions from Christ, which they behoved to observe; and that they could not receive such Prescriptions as the Magistrate gave.*

What he says in his 3d. about accepting a favour with a burden; and the similitude of a Father granting a Portion of Land, and enjoying the payment of Debts, is before answered. The impertinency of that Similitude is very palpable; if a Father should command his Son to worship God in secret Prayer, and withal give him some superstitious Directions; the Son were not to neglect secret Prayer, because of those superadded superstitious Injunctions. But it's time for me to weary of Repetitions.

In Object. 15. he supposes, *That the acceptance of the favour, had need of a Purgation by a Protestation; but the granting of the safe and peaceable exercise of the Ministry, ought not to have been protested against.* The many accounts upon which he says *the accepting of the Indulgence was so foul, that no Protestation could have saved the matter;* we have found upon examination to come to no account.

To the 16. Object. which rationally concludes, *That the Magistrates allowance being directed to none but to Ministers antecedently ordained, cannot be a just ground of Scruple.* He answers, *That this allowance being more than a Permission, did flow from*

from the Supremacy, and import the deriving of a Power to exercise the Function in such a place from the Magistrate. I reply, the allowing of Ministers to preach the Gospel, is the Magistrates Duty, and flows from no other Supremacy, than that which every Magistrate hath, as supream Magistrate in his own Dominions. If Magistrates should maintain, defend, protect Ministers in the exercise of their ministry, they should allow them to preach; otherways they should be obliged to maintain, &c. what they do not allow. He granted before, That the Magistrate may command Ministers to preach the Gospel, and command imports allowance, and something more; and where there is no settled Judicatories in the Kirk, which outed Ministers own, to settle Ministers in particular Charges, if the Magistrate may not in that case settle Ministers in particular Charges, but only command them to preach where they please, some places where there were most need of preaching, might be left utterly destitute, and the Magistrate could do nothing to remedy that evil.

We heard that the second Book of Discipline is for the Magistrates placing Ministers in some cases; and therefore to offend at the word *Allowance*, is not the kindly work of a well-informed, tender Conscience; but an effect of Ignorance. Altho' we should be displeased at sin, yet we should never offend or stumble (for offending properly imports stumbling) at sin; much less at what is lawful: all stumbling is sin, and flows from sin, and not from due Tenderness.

His answers to the 17 Obj. are his own false imaginations; for what the indulged Ministers did, was no virtual invalidating of their prior Ordination: Nor 2. did it say, That as to the Ministry, they depend upon any power in the Magistrate, as the fountain of their Ministry: It's true, the peaceable and safe exercise of their Ministry is from the Magistrate under God, who hath appointed Magistrates to be the shields of the earth, and nursing fathers to his Church. Nor is the acceptance of this favour a subjection unto any incroachment. Nor is this the Question, whether the restraints formerly laid on, were vincible or not, but whether the relaxation of these restraints was to be accepted or rejected. He cannot but acknowledge, that the Magistrates enjoyning and warranting, as he words it, includes a permission to Preach, and is a real relaxation of former restraints, and in so far might be made use of; but if the Author would have dealt fairly, he should have retained the words, which the Magistrate made use of in the Acts of Indulgence, and not foisted in his own words. The refusal of this relaxation, when the Magistrate offered it, would have been an offence and scandal to many persons; and it would have been so far from defeating *Era- stianism*, that it could onely have evidenced the refusers to be ignorant of the *Erastian* Controversie, and bred this false conceit, that the Magistrates relaxing of Civil restraints, which hindered the peaceable exercise of the Ministry; or that the Magistrates granting the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, by permitting and allowing Ministers to Preach and exercise the other parts of their Ministry,

is the exercise of *Eraſtianism*. The right way which the indulged Miniſters took, was to accept of what was good, and to reſuſe what was evil, and to give Reaſons for their reſuſal.

Neither did they virtually acknowledge any of the Magiſtrates wrongs, as he alledges in his 4. where he adds, that their plain Declaration to purge themſelves, will be but a contradiction and condemnation of their own deed, becauſe the impoſer can onely put a ſenſe and gloſs upon his own injunctions, and the granter of a warrant and favour, on the ſame; and in his ſenſe, it is, at leaſt, virtually accepted, by all who accept of it, if plain dealing be owned; and I ſuppoſe Miniſters when dealing with the Council, ſhould not walk upon fallacies, or on mental reſerves, or on what is equivalent.

Anſw. The Indulged Miniſters declared plainly to the Council what they did accept, and what they could not receive, as we heard before; but he thinks, that if they accepted of the favour, they could not by the plaineſt Declaration purge themſelves from acknowledging the Magiſtrates wrongs; that's a hard caſe, that men cannot accept of what is good and right from the Magiſtrate, but they muſt neceſſarily acknowledge the Magiſtrates wrongs: That's ſtrange, that they cannot diſtinguiſh and ſeparate good from ill, and right from wrong; and that their purging themſelves from acknowledging what is wrong, is a contradiction to and condemning their own deed, whereby they accepted of what was good. It ſeems the Author hath had ſome new-found Laws of contradiction, for by the old rules by which contradictions were wont to be judged, there

there will be no appearance of a contradiction found here. Was the Magistrates wrongs the Ministers deed? But he will prove what he hath said; let us hear how he will convince these Ministers, that they have contradicted and condemned themselves. Because, says he, the imposer can onely put a sense and gloss upon his own instructions, and the granter of a warrant and favour on the same: And in his sense it is at least virtually accepted by all who accept of it. And therefore the Ministers who accepted of the favour of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, did condemn this acceptance, by their plain Declaring, that they could not receive the instructions. *Answer.* A goodly Demonstration, onely it hath two faults; that it hath neither Reason, nor the appearance of Reason in it, and deserves no other answer but laughter. 1. If injunctions imposed be ambiguous, and are as capable of one sense as of another, then the imposer can best shew what is the sense, which is his sense, and they on whom such injunctions are imposed, should desire the imposer to declare his meaning, that they may be clear. If he do not explain his sense, then if the words be capable of a good sense, and of an ill, they should deal so candidly as to shew the imposer that they cannot keep such an injunction in the ill sense which it is capable of, but if the injunctions be given in words which are not in themselves ambiguous, but are clear, according to the common and generally received acceptation of them, then the imposer cannot in reason find fault, if these injunctions be observed according to the common received sense of the words; neither can he put any

sense he pleases upon words, which by common use have a determinate sense, for this would breed nothing but confusion; for if the sense of plain words in an injunction did depend not upon the common sense of all men, who use such words, but upon the meer will of the imposer, then by the word, light, he might mean darkness; and by the word, good, he might mean evil; and by the word, East, he might mean West; and by true Holiness, he might mean Superstition and Idolatry: And therefore this assertion of the Author, that the imposer can onely put a sense and gloss upon his own injunctions, must be taken with a grain of salt.

2. This assertion is nothing to the purpose in hand, for the sense of the Magistrates injunctions in the act of instructions, was clear enough: If the Ministers had received them in one sense, and the Magistrate had given them in another, there had been some reason for this Discourse about the sense of injunctions; but there was no Question betwixt the Magistrate and Ministers about the sense of the injunctions; the Ministers were clear enough, as to the Magistrates meaning, but they declared, they could receive no such Ecclesiastical instructions from the Magistrate, and that they had full prescriptions from Christ to regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry, and that they behoved in the discharge thereof, to be accountable to him. Now seeing they did not receive the injunctions at all, they received them in no sense, and therefore his Discourse about the sense of injunctions, is to little sense, and to no purpose in this place. 3. As to the favour of the safe exercise of their Ministry in the parishes,

to which they were indulged; the sense of the Magistrate was clearly enough known by the Acts of Indulgence, which did shew, that notwithstanding of restraints formerly laid upon them, they might now have the peaceable safe exercise of their Ministry, in these paroches. And Mr. *Hutcheson* in his Speech to the Council, in name of his Brethren, accepted of the favour of the free liberty of the Publick exercise of their Ministry, after so long a restraint, and of the Protection of Lawful Authority. This was very plain dealing with the Council, and was not a walking upon fallacies or mental reserves, nor on what was equivalent to these, as this Author falsely alledges. If any be pleased to imagine, that the Magistrate had some sense lurking in his own mind, which was not expressed in the Acts of Indulgence, the Indulged Ministers are not accountable for such imaginary senses. What they accepted was plainly imported in the Acts of Indulgence; and they plainly declared, what it was that they did accept. So that this Authors reasoning, that because the imposer can onely put a sense upon his own injunctions, &c. therefore the Indulged Ministers in declaring they did not acknowledge any of the wrongs of the Magistrate, did contradict and condemn their own deed, is a because that hath no cause in it, a fallacy, *a non causa, pro causa*; or rather it hath not so much colour as to deserve the name of a fallacy; and it will deceive none who have any skill of Reasoning, except it be such as have a mind to be deceived.

To the 18. and last Objection, which says, *That the acceptance of the Indulgence, imports no subjecting*

jecting of the Ministry to mens arbitrary disposal, but onely a subjecting of the persons of Ministers to the Magistrate. He Answers, That the Act of Indulgence did not onely mention Ministers repairing to such or such places, but spoke likewise of the exercise of their Ministry, which it allowed them. I Reply : This is an ill Argument; the Act of Indulgence spoke of the exercise of the Ministry, and allowed the exercise of it, and therefore the acceptance of the Indulgence was a subjecting of the Ministry to mens arbitrary disposal. If the Magistrates allowing of the exercise of the Ministry, doth subject the Ministry to the will and arbitrary disposal of men, then the Magistrates allowing of the exercise of the Ministry must be an ill thing, no way desirable; and so the Magistrate would be obliged not to allow of the exercise of the Ministry; these are pitiful absurdities. What he adds concerning the prescribing of several Rules, is impertinent, for the Act of Instructions was not the Act of Indulgence, and it was not accepted by the Indulged Ministers : But he will prove that their Ministry was subject to the arbitrary disposal of men, because they were made liable to punishment, for not observing the Rules and Injunctions prescribed. If this Argument were good, it would prove all the Non Conformists in *Scotland* to be Conformists, and subject to Prelacy, because they are all liable to punishment by the Law, for not observing the Laws requiring Conformity to Prelacy : But these things are not worthy to be repeated. In his 2. he says, These Sufferings indeed declared a subjection of their Persons, but their silence shall be found, I fear

fear, to have done more, and their former sin can be no ground to justify their present practice, in accepting of this Indulgence, which instead of being a relaxation, is a further wreathing of the yoke about our necks. I Answer, He had done better to have expressed his fears concerning his own silence, than to have expressed his fears of the silence of the outed Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, they might preach as they had access, though he did not know of it, it became him to be very sparing in censuring others for silence, who by his own subscription obliged himself not to be, and so not to preach in *Britain* or *Ireland*. I have seen this deed of his loaded with a great many Absurdities, and aggravated from this, that he was in no hazard of his life, or of any great suffering: But having heard from one intimately acquainted with him, that the man was naturally timorous, though he were alive, I would pity him, but being dead, I shall not so much as repeat the Absurdities, with which, this deed of his is loaded: Onely it needs not seem very strange if he who was so far transported with the passion of fear, when there was no great hazard, as to quit the exercise of his Ministry in these three Nations, hath been so far transported by other passions, as to inveigh against the Lawful exercise of the Ministry, of these who could not in Conscience neglect the opportunity of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, when the Lord in his good Providence inclined the heart of the Magistrate to grant it. That which they accepted was no yoke of bondage, but a very desirable Liberty, the Liberty of

the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, under the Protection of Lawful Authority.

Having answered the Authors Reasons against the Indulgence, as it was accepted, and refuted his Answers to the Objections, which in his conceit contained all that could be said in defence of that acceptance. I refer the refutation of the falsehoods, which are in the Historical part of this History, to those who are better acquainted with the matters of Fact than I am. It were fit that the Brethren who find themselves wronged by this Historian, should truly represent matters of Fact, relating to them which are misrepresented by this Historian; that both the unreasonableness of his Reasons, and the falsehood of his stories might be known to all.

I shall onely say somewhat for the Vindication of these of the Indulged Ministers, who appeared before the Council in *July*, 1673. that the Honesty and Faithfulness of those Ministers, and the unreasonableness of the slanders of this Historian may appear. I shall the rather take some notice of this part of his story, because as it takes up a great part of his Book, from Page 58 to 85, so the Author hath here done all he could to render those Ministers contemptible. And I have now before me, not onely the Narrative, a part whereof this Author hath insert in his Book, which was written by one, as I am informed, who was not present, but also a Narrative written by one who was present, who hath written a full answer to this History of the Indulgence, which, if it come to the hands of the Author of the Epistle prefixed to this History, it will, I hope, convince him that he was far out in his Prognosticks,

gnosticks, when he said, that the Reason of this History would never be answered but by clamour, for in it he may see his own and the Historians unreasonable clamours solidly refuted by sound Reason. In this Answer, the Reverend Author, who was one of those Ministers, who were cited before the Council, for not keeping the 29th. of *May*, hath set down the matter of Fact, and refuted the quibblings of the Author of the History. I refer the Reader for full satisfaction to the Authors Answer, and shall onely make use of so much of his paper as may sufficiently clear those Ministers, and Evidence that they refused Obedience to those Instructions, and gave a sufficient testimony against them. Those Ministers were interrogate by the Council, whether or not they had Preached upon the 29th. of *May*? Two or three of them who had Preached that day, upon the account that it was their ordinary Lecture-day, replied that they had Preached; whereupon they were commanded forth: All the rest answered, that they had not Preached; and being interrogate wherefore they did not Preach? They Replyed (as they had before agreed) that they were not free to observe any Anniversary day of Humane institution for Religious Worship, and that because they saw no ground for it in the Word of God; besides which they could not act in the matters of Gods solemn Worship. Whereupon they were fined by the Council in the half of a years stipend, which Act was intimated to them the *Tuesday* following. 1. Hence it appears that there was no ground to alledge; that those two or three who Preached, did observe the 29th. of *May*: And
it

it had been a reasonless and ridiculous thing to have forborn to preach upon their ordinary Lecture-day because it was the 29th. of *May*. 2. Nor any ground for quarrelling at the Indulged Ministers, for not speaking against the Narrative of an Act of Parliament, that was neither in their Summons, nor yet in their Sentence, and which was really made void by that Act made in the foregoing *August*, which was put in the place of that Act, which was in Sess. 2. of Parliament 1. 1662.

The Brethren being removed, some of them were called in together upon particular Summons, for Baptizing of Children in other Congregations: and that defence, which the Informer speaks of, that the instructions had not been intimate, did, as the answerer of the History of the Indulgence informeth, drop unwarily from the mouth of one. He says further that there were other Indulged Ministers there, who had never seen a double of the Instructions, and hence very rationally infers, that they could not be the condition upon which they received the Liberty to exercise their Ministry without molestation. If the Council had designed them for Conditions, they would have sent them as soon as the Indulgence, and would have made surer work in their intimation. And whatever was their Design in giving these Instructions, they cannot be with any Reason or Sense supposed to be the Condition upon which the Ministers accepted the Indulgence, seeing it was accepted by them ere they saw the Instructions, and many of them had not seen the Instructions for some years after they had exercised their Ministry in these Parishes to which they were Indulged.

Indulged. He shews also that the inferences which the Historian draws from that defence, *viz.* That it contained a tacite acknowledgment, that they would not have done what they did, if the Act had been intimate to them, and that in time coming, they would willingly obey them, and consequently, that the injunctions were just and righteous, and such as neither they, nor any other, should disobey, whether because of the matter, or because of the power enjoying them, are without all Reason, and will not follow from that Antecedent, by thrice nineteen. Seeing this onely follows, that therefore they ought to be free of all damage intended, because of that Fact. And further, he shews, that the Answer which the Historian suggests, *viz.* That they might not be answerable to their Master, to refuse to Baptize any Child within the Covenant, brought to them for that end, is a lax tale; for 1. (says he) it will be hard for him to make out such an Obligation. 2. The Order of the Church determines the contrary. 3. They must have it testified that they are within the Covenant. 4. That the Parents, at least the presenters, are not scandalous. 5. And that they are not grossly ignorant, or if the testimony be not from one who takes inspection of their knowledge, they must examine them in the grounds of Religion. He adds after all this; there was a Macer sent to the utter Council House, who summoned the whole number of these Ministers, to compear before the Council on *Tuesday* next.

He adds, that in the interval betwixt that *Thursday* and the *Tuesday* in the ensuing week, they met

met frequently every week-day, and twice upon the *Tuesday*: And partly from memory, and partly from draughts of papers, which he had by him, he shews, that at their very first meeting, one of their number told them, that he heard a whisper, that subscribed doubles of the Instructions would be delivered to them at their next compearance. Whereupon they thought fit, that there should be a draught of a paper, bearing in it a Testimony, not onely against the matter of the injunctions, but also, and mainly against the undue power of Ecclesiastick Supremacy, assumed by the Magistrate, from upon some of them at least (as was generally apprehended) had both their formation and injunction, and not only against it, as productive of these, but also of all other things of that Nature since the year 1660. Afterwards there was a draught produced, containing in its Narrative a thankful acknowledgment of the taking off Restraints, and for granting the safe outward Liberty of the exercise of the Ministry, as also, a sad complaint of what was grievous in the three Acts of Council, *Sep. 3. 1672.* complexly taken. Next there was a full and clear Assertion and Declaration of what was due to the Magistrate about Ecclesiastick Affairs, and what was not due to him in Ecclesiastick matters, in a strict consonancy unto the Judgment and Expressions of the greatest of the *Anti-erastian* Divines. Then there was a representation of Grievances, in seven full Paragraphs, more particularly of all contained in the foresaid three Acts, and most particularly of those contained in the Act of Injunctions; all which carry in their bosom a testimony against the sinfulness and

Usurpation

Usurpation manifested in these matters of Grievance. And lastly, There was a full Petition for Redress. This Paper was lookt upon, as too large, and therefore a shorter draught was fallen upon, not differing as to Method, nor yet as to Matter and Substance, but onely contracted in fewer words; a double whereof (saith the Answerer of this History) I have in my hand; and I remember it was much debated, as to the alteration, detracting and adding of words and clauses; but what those particular Debates were, I cannot so distinctly remember, onely one thing I do distinctly remember, that the principal Debate was about the adding of a Clause unto the close of a Paragraph about the Injunctions or Instructions for the further clearing of it, the Clause was conceived in these words, *That we cannot receive from the Magistrate any Instructions in Regulating us in the exercise of our Ministry.* How this Debate came to a close, the Informer does truly relate; for it being overtured, that instead of the former Clause, this should be insert, *viz. We cannot receive from the Magistrate Instructions formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, for regulating us in the exercise of our Ministry.* All did acquiesce.

This Paper being compleat upon Tuesday before twelve hours it was appointed to be drawn in fair writ, that after Dinner it might be Subscribed before their Appearance before the Council. But at that time, on a sudden the turning of it into a Directory (as the Informer says) and the appointing of one in their name to declare the substance of it before the Council, was generally consented unto
by

by Indulged and not Indulged. In voting who should be their mouth, the whole votes ran upon Mr. *George Hutcheson* and Mr. *Alexander Blair*, and each of them voted to other, and Mr. *H.* had the greater number by very few. Upon their compareance before the Council, the Clerk of the Council did read in their hearing an Act, wherein each of them were fined in the half of a years stipend; after the reading whereof, Mr. *Hutcheson*, addressing his Speech to my Lord Chancellour, after he had spoken somewhat relative to the Act of Fining, added, *That their Lordships would be pleased, not to burden them with Impositions in the matter of their Ministry, wherein they were the Servants of Christ, and they being men who demeaned themselves as became Loyal Subjects:* The Ministers thinking themselves dismissed, turned towards the door, my L. Chancellour required them to stay, and did appoint the Clerk to deliver to each of them a subscribed Copy of that Act of Injunctions of Sep. 3. 1672. A good number of those who were first in the Roll, and to whom these Instructions had not been sent before, did take these papers in their hands, looking and expecting that Mr. *H.* should have spoken the things agreed upon amongst them formerly; but he having spoken somewhat already, thought he was not called to speak till the Paper came to his own hand: When the Officer came to Mr. *A. B.* he taking the paper in his hand, among other things, had these words, or to that purpose.

That he could not receive Instructions from them for regulating him in the exercise of his Ministry, for if he did so, he should not be Christs Ambassadour,
but

but theirs : Whereupon he was by the Chancellour committed to a Macer. Upon Mr. *A. Blairs* commitment to the Macer, one Minister, to wit, of those who were in the Roll before him, said to my my L. Chancellour, *He believed that the rest of the Ministers of that Company, were of Mr. Blairs judgment, whereof himself was one.* And another said, *That one of these Rules did bring Ministers in direct subordination to Prelacy, contrary to their Principles.* Let me add; and one said, *That one of these Rules was impracticable;* and all of them spoke more fully in these purposes than is here expressed.

The very next Person in the Roll to Mr. *Blair*, and so ranked in the Printed Act containing the Fining, when upon the back of that confusion, the paper was offered to him, did to my certain knowledge, though this be omitted by the Informer, turn towards my Lord Chancellour, and with an audible voice said, *My Lord, I adhere to that which Mr. Blair hath spoken;* in speaking of which words, my L. Chancellour did stare him in the face, but yet did not commit him to the Macer, and no wonder, seeing he spoke these words with much composure of spirit, and without the least appearance of distempering Passion; with a futable Ministerial Gravity, and also with a futable Respect unto Lawful Authority, both in expression and gesture. Mr. *Hutcheson* stepping in to take off Mr. *B.* and to remove any prejudice, that he apprehended the Council might have at him, he 1. humbly desired their Lordships not to misunderstand his Brother, Mr. *Alexander Blair*; for as for Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastick for regulating Ministers in the exercise of

the
same
Book
page
451

of their Ministry, he hoped their Lordships intended not to make or impose any such upon them, who were the servants of Christ in these matters. He uses just the words that Mr. B. made use of, onely with the addition of *intrinsically Ecclesiastick*, (a term both intelligible, and that ought to be understood by all who meddle in these matters) for clearing of them as was agreed upon in the paper; and so not onely homologates what Mr. B. had spoke, but also, though in modest terms, requests for the retracting of these Rules, refuses Obedience to them, and gives a Reason wherefore Ministers could not yield Obedience unto them; and albeit, as the Informer says, he was dissatisfied with some circumstances in Mr. B. speaking, and with the defectiveness of what was spoken, yet, with the matter of it, he was never dissatisfied: Here then is a clear and plain testimony given by Mr. H. in his own name, and in the name of his Brethren, not onely against the matter of these Rules, but also against the Power imposing them in so far as undue. 2. In the other part of his Speech, which was in these words: *But as for the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastick, whereby they might judge of matters of Religion, in order to their own Act, whether they would approve or discountenance such a way, he knew no Reformed Divine that did deny it unto them; and did humbly desire again, that their Lordships would not mistake his Brother.* He added this part of the Speech to the former, because he conceived that the Council did think that Mr. B. granted not this piece of Power to the Magistrate, and that therefore the Chancellour was incensed; and

to rectifie this mistake, he did shew that this was the judgment of all Reformed Divines, and so the judgment of his Brother, Mr. B. whom he accounted to be one of these Reformed Divines; and he had good ground to be assured of his assent to what he spoke, because what was due, and what was not due to the Magistrate in, or about Ecclesiastick matters, was condescended upon in that paper, agreed upon among themselves in private. After Mr. H. had spoken this, another Minister said, *He could not receive Ecclesiastick Canons from their Lordships, but, as for Civil significations of their pleasure, under the hazard of Civil Penalties, he could say nothing to that:* And then another Minister did homologate what he had spoken.

In the close of all, Mr. H. in the name of all, spoke as was formerly agreed upon; and in the former part of his Speech did shew, that a formal Ecclesiastick Power could not be allowed to the Magistrate, though a Power objectively Ecclesiastick was allowed to him, and did so clearly signifie, that they could not obey these Injunctions, that my Lord Chancellour answered him in these words, and noother, *Then, Sir, we will punish you:* Unto which Mr. H. did not reply in words, but only by gesture. Although this Historian sets himself always to represent Mr. B. as separated from his Brethren, and acting in a divided way from them, yet he was ever one with them as to Judgment, Affection, and Action, though to their very great grief he was separated from them, as to his suffering. 1. He agreed with them in one and the same paper to be presented to the Council. 2. He consented with

your C^o pleasure in joined under the other C^o of punishment only. and instant by what was spoken

others to turn it into a Directory, and to choose one who in the name of the rest should speak the substance of it before the Council. 3. He had many votes, almost the half, to speak the mind of the rest. 4. What he spoke was in the paper, and some did adhere formally, and all did cordially and really adhere upon the matter to what was spoken by him. 5. And what was spoken by others to that purpose, did agree with what he spoke, as to matter, sense, and meaning. 6. After that Mr. *Hutcheson* had spoken to take him off, he was offering to say, that he meant the same things which Mr. *H.* did express. 7. In the Prison he made offer to some of his Brethren (a thing certain to me, albeit the Informer speak doubtingly of it) that if it could be a mean to liberate him, he would give it under his hand, *That what Mr. H. spoke was his very judgment.* It will not be fit to take notice of every expression, which in that Rhetorical flaunt, and to say no worse, that windy rant, which the Historian hath about page 53. But as that worthy man Mr. *B.* if he were alive, would abhor the Historians overlasting commendations of him, to the defaming of all his fellow Brethren: So it will not be unfit for the vindication of these, whom the Historian labours to defame, to add a few particulars.

1. Some of these Ministers who were before the Council did not take any of these papers in their hands, albeit they had never seen an authentick Copy before; others did, and so did Mr. *B.* whether he let his Copy drop out of his hand, I can neither affirm, nor deny, neither think I it any thing material: Others, for any thing I know, might also have dropped

dropped them after the same manner ; but whether they did that, or whether they carried them away in their hands or pockets, is little to the purpose; for what ever Testimony he gave against the things contained therein, all the rest gave the like, and large as much : and so whatever he did in perpetuating the Testimony of the Church of *Scotland*, the rest did the like. 2. That his Imprisonment raised some noise in the City, I grant ; but how it could carry with it some sad reflection on the rest, I cannot see, seeing they had given as full a Testimony as he had given, and they were not obliged to commit themselves to Prison, because he was committed. 3. True it is, these Ministers met together after his commitment, to deliberate, if possibly they could do any thing for his Release, with whom also there met some serious and judicious Ministers in the Town, who had met with them several times before. It is true, that some of these having heard the Forgeries and Lies which presently flew from about the Parliament-House, did overture and press the doing of something for owning and seconding Mr. *Blairs* Testimony, &c. And this they did not out of shame and sorrow for the unfaithfulness of the rest, as the Historian insinuateth, but for obstructing the obloquy and clamour of the Vulgar. But every thing done and spoken before the Council by any, either in their own name, or in the name of others, being brought forth, considered, canvassed and examined, they were convinced, that any such thing was needless and impertinent ; yea, the taking of a groundless guilt upon them : What he hath farther here, is the

forgery of his eccho's at *Edinburgh*. 4. What he hath further here is nothing but forgery and calumny; as that the proceedings of these Ministers were point blank contrary to the actings of the Kirk of *Scotland*, and the Faithful in it, and that there was a motion made of writing about the Magistrates Power in Church matters, and that there was need of new Principles to justify their proceedings. 5. I cannot pass his raking into the ashes of worthy Mr. *H.* If the comparison were not a disparagement to a Person of such worth, I would say, that for grace, for gifts, for Ministerial qualifications of all sorts, for usefulness in his Generation, and service unto his Lord and Master therein, and for usefulness to the Church of God in after Generations also. Mr. *G.H.* was a Person above the Historian, and that he was free both of *Pedantus* and *Plagiariæ*, his most useful Works left behind him does declare; wherein every thing is judiciously drawn out of the Fountain of the Word of God, and not by way of cloutry out of Humane Authors, and that he had the least tincture of the Opinion of *Vedelius*, is a thing that cannot be made out from his Writings or Actings.

Although I need not add any thing to the commendation of Mr. *Hutcheson*, whose Works praise him in the Churches; yet having had occasion to be intimately acquainted with him, and having found him misrepresented by some, I cannot forbear to do him right, after his death, in representing him justly as I found him, in frequent conversing with him. I found him to be a very lovely man, of a sweet, amiable, loving and compassionate disposition;

a man of great candour and ingenuity, and though of eminent gifts, yet very lowly and condescending to these, who were of low degree. I found him ready to receive light in Theology from those who were every way far inferiour to him, as might be made out by many pregnant instances, and how much he was regretted, and his death lamented by the Godly Ministers and Professors in the place he lived, and through the Land is so well known and notore, that it were needless to be at pains to clear it to any that is in this our Church; his name for eminency in abilities Ministerial of all kinds, and Piety, being so savoury and Famous therein, and his Works for the Churches good, so much approven, and applauded by eminent Divines abroad, together with the experience both of Godly and Judicious Ministers and Professors at home, do sufficiently to the stopping of the mouth of all detraction and envy, commend him in the gate. 6 That the rest of the Ministers did reproach their Brother Mr. *Blair*, is a forgery, either minted in his own brain, or coined by some of his correspondents. It's true, that some of these Ministers, who did go to my L. Chancellour that Afternoon, to plead for his Releasement, did declare, that my L. Chancellour did not lay the weight of his being Imprisoned, upon what he spoke, but upon other things which he did highly aggravate, and I forbear to mention further, and it was also said, that he left out some words, which had been agreed upon, but none can with any shadow of Reason, call such speeches reproaches. It's also false, that *Micajah* carried rudely before *Jehoshaphat* and *Ahab*, he carried with that composure of

mind and affections, with that gravity and reverence to Lawful Authority, that did become a Prophet of the Lord. 7. I pass his uncharitable insinuation, *That the rest of the Ministers had not prayed that day for Counsel and Courage, in Order to their appearance, &c.* and Mr. Blairs telling of his attainments, though it be well known, that he never had the humour to talk of such things; and some could have informed, *That he bowed not the knee that morning, but in the company of, and in conjunction with two, who were lodged with him in the same Room.* I pass several other amplifications of this Historian, and shall mark a thing which he omits, which is this: Not long before his death, 24 hours at most, two serious and judicious Ministers of the Gospel visiting him, and seeing that his time could not be long, did tell him, that he was now very shortly to compear before his Judge, and therefore did urge him to tell, if he had Peace, in his accepting of the Indulgence, and use making of it, these years by gone: To whom he replied, *That he had not the least Challenge upon that account; and added moreover, that he could not have had Peace, in staying from his Charge, Forcible and Legal restraints being removed.* But our Faithful Historian passes this in silence, and also on the contrary, falsely infers, *That he Witnessed against the Indulgence,* pag. 54. It's true indeed, that he with others Witnessed against the Instructions, but that he Witnessed against the Indulgence, is most false. From this it is clear also, that in his judgment, it was not necessary to Witness before the Council against these Instructions, or any other thing, supposed, as intended,

tended, to be a concomitant to the Indulgence, unless they were particularly put to it; seeing without this, he had exercised his Ministry some years upon the account of the Indulgence, and that without a challenge. This Narration of the matter of Fact I have taken out of the Answer of the History of the Indulgence: The Reverend Author of that Answer is a Person of that Piety, Candour, and Integrity, that none who know him, will call in Question the truth of what he relates concerning his own actings, and the actings and speeches of his Brethren, of which he was an eye and ear-witness; and which he was so much concerned to observe and remember, upon many accounts, and which were kept in remembrance, not only by Papers, but by the Debates which presently did arise upon these matters of Fact. I shall not say, that the Author of the History of Indulgence hath Industriously forged falsehoods in matters of Fact, but hath written according to the Informations sent to him from some of his Correspondents. Yet, I cannot but wonder, that seeing he would turn an Historian, and write a part of the Church-History of the time in which he lived, that he hath so palpably transgressed the Laws of History, in concealing truths, which tended to the Vindication of the Indulged Ministers, in misrepresenting and misconstruing, and perverting their actions and speeches, in publishing gross untruths to their prejudice: And it will not justify him that he had no better Information. For, 1. This was a fault to publish a History of Church-matters, of such importance and consequence, without full and certain Information. 2. He might have had

better Information, if he would have sought for it, and seeing he would write a History, he was in Conscience obliged to have made a most diligent search for truth, and impartially received and related it. 3. It was a fault, that he received his Informations from Persons disaffected to the Indulged Ministers, and did not send to the Indulged Ministers, to hear what they had to say, concerning their practice, and the Reasons of it, he should have had two ears, and followed the old direction, *audi alteram partem*, and the rather because, he not only as an Historian, relates matters of Fact, but upon these, he forms grievous Libels, Accusations, and Censures, he should have heard them before he had publicly condemned them. 4. If he had considered, that it's one of the Devils grand designs in this time, to bring the Ministers of the Gospel, and the Gospel with them into contempt, and had considered how effectually a lying Spirit works in some of this generation, and how many shameless, senseless lies, which have no appearance of truth, or probability, but have manifest Evidences of falshood in their face, are confidently vented against Ministers, especially Indulged Ministers, it would have made him more cautelous, in receiving Informations of that nature; and he would not have suffered himself to be so miserably abused, in receiving, nor would he have abused others, in publishing such falshoods. It's sad to see how much the Father of Lies, and the accuser of the Brethren, hath prevailed by these calumnies and slanders, to bring almost all Ministers to be despised by some. But the Lord who is excellent in working, and brings good out of evil, hath confirmed

firmed many in their adherence to the Ministry of his Servants, and particularly to the Ministry of Indulged Ministers, and hath reclaimed some, who were beginning to be disaffected to them, by making them to observe the activity of the Father of Lies, in calumniating these Ministers; for the Lies being palpable, that any who will not shut their eyes, may see them to proceed from the Father of Lies. They conclude, that there must be good in the Ministry of the Indulged Ministers, seeing the Father of Lies doth set himself so much against it.

From the preceding Relation of the matter of Fact, the Faithfulness of these Ministers, who were convened before the Council, *July* 1673. is very evident. For suppose, it had fallen out, that they had gotten leave to speak nothing before the Council, yet their unanimous agreeing in the paper before mentioned, and their appointing one of their number in their presence to speak the substance of that paper to the Magistrate; and their declared Resolution, to adhere to what was spoken according to it, doth evidence their Faithfulness and Integrity. 2. Although, it's likely, that if that jumble had not fallen in, through the Commitment of Mr. B. to a Macer, more would have been said; yet that which was spoken was a Faithful Testimony, even in the judgment of the Author of the History of the Indulgence; for he grants that Mr. B. gave an honest Testimony, and he asserts, and very rationally proves, that Mr. H. spoke the same upon the matter with Mr. B. and added some more, *That a Power formally Ecclesiastical could not be allowed*
to

to the Magistrate, and several others spoke to the same purpose with Mr. H. and Mr. B. 3. That Obedience to these Instructions, was refused, is clear from the Chancellours Answer to Mr. H. which was in these words, *Then we will punish you.* And hence it is evident, that as the Impositions and Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical, Ecclesiastick Canons, Rules regulating Ministers in the Exercise of their Ministry, were fit terms to design the Impositions and Instructions which were in the Council's Acts, as the Author of the History acknowledges; for he acknowledges, that some of them were indeed formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, pag. 65. And he cannot but acknowledge that all of them were Impositions; and as the words they used, so the time, and place, and occasion, upon which they were spoken to the Council by these Ministers, and the special Reasons given against some of these Instructions, did clearly Evidence, that these Ministers spoke of the Injunctions and Instructions under debate; so we see that the Magistrate understood it so; for he would not have threatned to punish them for not observing Instructions which he had not given to them: And as they declared they could not receive these Instructions, so they declared they could not accept of any Instructions of that nature from the Magistrate, and so this was not a blind, as he acknowledges, pag. 65. but a *vidimus*: By which the Magistrate might see, that they could not receive any such Rules from their Lordships. This cuts off a great many of the Historians Quibblings. Having sufficiently cleared these Ministers, I shall briefly touch upon some things which the Historian carps at.

at. He quarrels, *pag. 64, 65.* at that Assertion, *That we would not receive from the Magistrate Instructions formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, for regulating us in the exercise of our Ministry.* And says, *That he would not have been for subscribing a Paper, which had this in it, nor yet for using it as a directory.* He is for the Assertion, if the words *formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical* were out; but the putting of these words in did put him out of all conceit with this Assertion. This is strange, that words which do no way overturn or vitiate that Assertion, but clear it, should have made such an alteration upon him; that which was a mean of harmony, and ended all debate among the Brethren, would have divided him from his Brethren, in this matter: I see he would have done ill, if he had been present, and no good; and yet it may be if he had been present among his Brethren, and heard their reasonings, he might have been better Informed. It's a great loss to some, especially if they have much of self-conceit, to be alone, and left to their own solitary imagination. But let us hear what he hath to say against this Assertion: He falls upon it with *Dilemma's*, which threaten with two terrible horns. *Which (says he) in my judgment, was either nothing to the purpose, or which is worse, was a betraying of the Cause.* How! nothing less than Folly, Foppery, or else Falshood and Treachery: These Brethren had need to take heed to themselves, for he hath a dreadful Design upon them, to bereave them either of their Wit or Honesty; he will be sure, if they be not aware, to push one of his horns through their head, and if
that

that miss, he will gore with the other through the heart, he will have them to be either Fools or Knaves. If the pushing of this horned Argument be answerable to its bellowing and lowing, there will be a dreadful Encounter and great loss. But now having shaken these two terrible horns, and given them fair warning, what parts to guard, he makes a nearer approach. *For* (saith he) *either this was understood in reference to those Rules, which the Council prescribed in their Act, Sept. 3. 1672. or not.* Yes; be sure it is either the Fox or the fern-bush: But he makes surer work than so, for the horns of this *Dilemma* are contradictory, and the Brethren must of necessity fall upon one of them; but there is no hazard yet, for the one of the horns is harmless, it's for them, and they for it; their assertion had reference to these Rules. He insists, and shews them two new horns: *For* (says he) *if it was understood with this reference, then either hereby, they meant to justify and defend their refusing to accept of these Instructions, or to justify their accepting of them.* This last horn hath a terrible appearance, it's an uncouth, unexpected horn; but there is no hazard, for be what it will, it is no horn; for it hath no solidity when ye gripe it; and no wonder, for it is but a Phantasm, one of the Authors vain imaginations; the Brethren never dream'd of such a thing, as accepting, or justifying of acceptance; and as the Author lightly made this fantastick horn, the Brethren do as lightly make nothing of it, by disowning it, and so it's evanished; light come, light gone. The Brethren meant by this Assertion, to refuse, and to justify their refusing

to accept of these Instructions. But he will prove that they meant not to refuse, and justify their refusing to accept of these Instructions. 1. Says he, *Why then was Mr. Blair so much condemned, who did but refuse the accepting of these, that had been expressed in the Act, and were then exhibited.* The Argument runs thus; *The Brethren condemned Mr. Blair for refusing the Instructions, and therefore they meant not to refuse them.* The consequence is pretty good, but the antecedent is naught, it's manifestly false; never did any of the Brethren condemn Mr. Blair for refusing of the Instructions, for that was the thing which they had all agreed to do, and which they did. But 2. Says he, *Why was it not plainly affirmed, that they would not receive these, which the Council tendred unto them.* *Ans.* It was so plainly affirmed, that the Chancellour said, *Then we will punish you.* And as Mr. Blair did plainly refuse them, so did others, and particularly Mr. H. as the Author of the History not only grants, but proves, when he proves that Mr. H. said the same upon the matter with Mr. B. 3. Sath he, *Why was there so much debate about a general Thesis, when the clear assertion of the Hypothesis, would have saved both Credit and Conscience?* *Ans.* This Argument is of the same nature with the rest, that is, stark naught; there was a great debate amongst the Ministers about the wording of a general Thesis, and therefore they meant not to refuse the Instructions, and to justify their refusal. If it had been a Question among them, whether they should accept of these Instructions or not, it might have made so mething out of that Question, against any
that

that had held the affirmative, if they had continued in that Opinion, but that was not so much as brought under debate; they were clear, they could not receive these Instructions; and to prevent the imposing any more injunctions of that nature upon them, they resolved to set down a general Thesis, which might exclude all Instructions and Injunctions of the Magistrate, which might incroach and intrench upon the Calling of the Ministry. And any who have studied and understood that Question of the bounds of the Magistrates, and Ministers Power and Authority, will not wonder, if there was a considerable time taken up in that Debate, *De finibus*. They who are most ignorant, are often most confident in their decisions of these questions; but I suppose it will be ordinarily found that they who think there is no difficulty in ridding these Marches, are either Persons who have not read these questions, or have not understood what they read. If I had been present with these Brethren, at that Debate, I could have better answered his Question, *Why there was so much debate about this general Thesis*: Yet as it's obvious, that it was very convenient, that they should agree upon a general Thesis, which might prevent invasions upon the Ministerial Calling, or at least discover them, that they might not be complied with: So it was not easie to set down a general Rule in such ticklish matter, which would admit of no exceptions, and prevent all cavils. The Brethren, who thought the Assertion might stand, as it was first conceived, without the addition of the words *formall and intrinsically Ecclesiastical*, had much to say for their Opinion; that it was not com-

petent

petent for the Magistrate to instruct and teach Ministers, how to exercise their Ministry, or to form Instructions, Regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry: For the forming and prescribing Rules or Canons of that nature, is the proper *Formal, Intrinsic* exercise, of Ecclesiastick Governours: As it is not competent for Ministers to make Civil Laws and Statutes, so it is not competent for Magistrates to make Ecclesiastick Instructions, Rules, or Canons, Regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministerial Function; for this would bring the Magistrate in upon the Calling of the Ministry, and confound these Callings, which the Lord hath made distinct. Again, the Brethren, who thought it convenient to add the words *formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical*, have considered, that although the Assertion, without this addition, in its genuine sense, was sound, yet it might be Interpreted by Persons disposed to Cavil and Calumniate in a wrong sense, which would not agree with the judgment of *Anti-erastian* Divines; who though they do not allow to the Magistrate a Power *Formally* Ecclesiastical, and so allow not to him a Power of forming Canons Ecclesiastical, Regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry; yet they allow to the Magistrate Power to Command Ministers to exercise their Ministry, and to do their Office according to the Word of God. In the first Chapter of the Second Book of Discipline we have these words. *The Civil Power should Command the Spiritual to exercise, and do their Office according to the Word of God.* And afterward, in that same Chapter, *The Magistrate neither ought to Preach, administer the Sacraments, nor*
execute

execute the Censures of the Kirk, nor yet prescribe any Rule how it should be done, but Command the Ministers to observe the Rule Commanded in the Word, and punish the Transgressors by Civil means. And Chap. 10. which is of the Office of a Christian Magistrate, in the Church, we have these words: *That it pertains to the Office of a Christian Magistrate to see, that the Kirk be not invaded, nor hurt by false Teachers and Hirelings, nor the rooms thereof be occupied by dumb dogs and idle bellies: To assist and maintain the Discipline of the Kirk, and punish them Civilly, that will not Obey the Censure of the same, without confounding always the one Jurisdiction with the other.* And afterwards they add, *To make Laws and Constitutions agreeable to Gods Word, for advancement of the Kirk and Policy thereof, without Usurping any thing that pertains not to the Civil Sword, but belongs to the Offices that are meerly Ecclesiastical, as is the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, using Ecclesiastical Discipline, and the Spiritual execution thereof; or any part of the Power of the Spiritual Keys, which our Master gave to the Apostles and their true Successours. And although Kings and Princes, that be Godly, sometimes by their own Authority, when the Kirk is corrupted, and all things out of Order, place Ministers, and restore the true Service of the Lord, after the Example of some Godly Kings of Judah, and divers Godly Kings and Emperours, in the Light of the New Testament; yet, where the Ministry of the Kirk is once Lawfully Constitute, and they that are placed, do their Office Faithfully, all Godly Princes and Magistrates ought to bear, and obey their voice,*

and

and reverence the Majesty of the Son of God, speaking in them.

The Author of the History of the Indulgence, pag. 62. grants that concession of Orthodox *Anticraſtian* Divines, *That Magiſtrates may and ſhould put Miniſters to their Duty, in following the Rules and Injunctions preſcribed by Chriſt, in their Political way, and by their Political Penalties*: And hence it will follow, that Miniſters ſhould not reſuſe Chriſts injunctions, becauſe the Magiſtrate commands them to obſerve them, and by their Political Power and Political Penalties, puts them to obſerve them. He grants alſo, *That Magiſtrates may Civilly confirm, and inforce Canons and Rules, Miniſterially cleared and concluded by Church Judicatories*. And pag. 63. He diſtinguiſhes Inſtructions, into theſe which are concerning ſuch things, as are always neceſſary to the right exerciſe of the Miniſtry, or are concerning alterable Circumſtances; which onely *hic & nunc*, can be called neceſſary: And concerning the former, he ſaith, *That the Magiſtrate cannot enjoyn theſe Miniſterially, as holding forth the mind of God, becauſe ſo he would not be a Magiſtrate, but a Miniſter*. But he grants, *That the Magiſtrate may Politically inforce theſe Inſtructions, in a well Reformed and Inſtituted Church, after they have been Miniſterially held forth, by the Authorized Miniſterial Interpreters of the Word*. And in a Church confuſed and needing Reformation, he does not deny to the Magiſtrate a Power to enjoyn ſuch things, as are at all times neceſſary, to the right exerciſe of the Miniſtry: But he alledges, *This latter Caſe is not ours*. But it ſeems he hath not conſidered

the Case of this Church, or hath had very bad Information concerning it. If the Case of this Church had not been confused, he durst not have written and Printed such a History, nor written Letters to encourage some young Men to counteract the Suffering Ministers of this Church, and to refuse to be subject to them; he might possibly, when he was in another Nation, in his study among his Books, imagine that this Church was not confused, but well ordered, and needing no Reformation. But alas, our Confusions and Disorders are more real than to be removed by the force of his imagination: We see them, we find them, and they who have any sense groan under them; and we want these Assemblies, which were a part of the Order of this Church, and the means to preserve Order, to prevent Confusion, or rectifie Disorders, if they had entred. But he will prove, that this Church is not confused and needing Reformation. I wish he could prove this; but I have found his former Arguings so fallacious, that I fear this proof prove like the rest; that is, prove nothing. But let us hear him: *The latter Case (says he) is not our Case, unless by this concession we would grant Power and Liberty to any Magistrate to overturn the best Reformed Church; that is, to the end he may order all things in it as he pleaseth, which was never understood by the users of this distinction.* The Argument runs thus: *If we grant that this Church is confused, and needs Reformation, we grant a Power and Liberty to the Magistrate to overturn the best Reformed Church, &c. but we cannot grant a Power to the Magistrate to overturn, &c. and therefore we cannot grant that*

this Church is confused, and needs Reformation. The first proposition is manifestly false: This is a hard case, that a poor Church confused and disordered, may not confess to God, nor declare before Men, that it is confused, and needs Reformation, may not relate its case, as it is, but it must, by the confession or concession of the truth, become guilty of giving Power and Liberty to the Magistrate to overturn the Church. There's no shadow of Reason for this connexion; although the Church confess that the Magistrate hath overturned her, that grants no Power and Liberty to the Magistrate to overturn the Church. Does a poor mans complaint, that his Neighbour hath come in and made Abuse and Disorder in his House, grant a power and liberty to his Neighbour, to make Abuse and Disorder, or a Power to Order all things in it as he pleaseth? Shall the complaint of an injurious Fact grant a Power and Liberty to do injury? The Magistrates Ordering all things in the Church as he pleaseth, is impertinently brought in under this head, for he is speaking of Instructions set down in the Word of God, and which are concerning things, at all times, necessary to the right exercise of the Ministry. If the Magistrate would give only such Injunctions, I suppose few would complain; for all grant, that the Magistrate may put Ministers to do their necessary Duty, prescribed to them in the Word of God. As to the alterable circumstances, he excludes the Magistrate from any Power in reference to these; but he doth not prove what he says, for though the Church have power to determine such Circumstances, according to the general Rules of the Word,

it will not follow, that the Magistrate hath no power in reference to these Circumstances: If he had said, that the Church onely hath that power, and proved what he said, he would have said something. *If the Church hath Power (saith he) by what Law can the Church be robbed of that Power given by Christ?* They will easily Answer, That the Magistrate may have power, in reference to some Circumstances, and exercise that power, and yet not rob the Church of any power which Christ hath given to it. For both the Magistrate and Church may have some power, in reference to these common Circumstances, and exercise it, and yet not rob one another of the power which they have; as there are some Commons for Pasturage, which all Persons in the adjacent bounds may make use of for Pasturage, and yet not rob one another. Then he questions, by what right can the judgment of this matter be committed *in prima instantia*, at the very first unto the Magistrate, or rather wholly and solely to him. But this Question alters the state of the Question; for the Magistrate may have power, in reference to these Circumstances, though he have not the sole power; the Author of the late Apology, pag. 169. & 170. shews, That both Magistrates and Ministers may upon the dispensation of Mercy and Judgment call for Thanksgiving or Humiliation, indict days of Humiliation and Thanksgiving; and acknowledges, that for more harmony in this publick work, and convenient following of it, with benefit and advantage, to Church and State, it were expedient that Magistrates and Ministers did previously consult. And pag. 167, 168. He shews, That

That Magistrates may Convocate Synods: But this is not privative of the power of Church-Officers, who may and ought to come together of themselves, as the necessities of the Church requires.

The Author of the Answer to the History of the Indulgence, hath very rationally shewed, that if the Magistrate appoint the *Thursday* of any week, to be a Muster-day in every Parish of his Dominions, he may discharge any Publick Sermon upon that *Thursday*: This is an extrinsecal circumstantial regulating or limiting of the Publick exercise of the Ministry, which cannot in Reason be denied to the Magistrate, who finds it necessary to have a Muster of all his Subjects who are fit to carry Arms in one day. To give the Magistrate an unlimited power in Circumstantials, were to give him a destructive power; for so he might appoint a House for Publick Worship, which would not contain the third part of the Parish: And to give him no power in reference to Circumstantials, were unreasonable; and to imagine the Marches betwixt Magistrates and Ministers, can be Mathematically defined, and brought to a very Mathematical point, is a conceit that will not readily come in the head of any man, who hath read and understood any thing of these Questions: And I perceive the Historian himself hath a Latitude to come and go upon; for pag. 81, & 82. where he says, *And I shall willingly grant, that what agreeth to Magistrates, as such, agreeth to all Magistrates good and bad; yet it may be maintained that more may be allowed in such Magistrates, as are really minding Reformation, &c. than in such as are open Enemies thereunto, &c.* And, I suppose, this

is one Reason of difference among Divines in these matters; some who have lived under Reforming Magistrates, have allowed more, and others who have lived under Magistrates who abused their power have allowed less; and when these concessions are calculated, according to the disposition of Rulers, which are so variable, and not according to the Rule of the Word of God, and the natures and ends of the Magistratical and Ministerial Offices; What wonder, if their concessions vary one from another? All these things being considered, it was no wonder, that these Brethren thought it convenient, to add the clause *Formally and Intrinsically Ecclesiastical*, to cast off the Cavils of these who would have alledged, that the Assertion without this did deny all power to the Magistrate about the extrinsick Circumstantials of the exercise of the Ministry. And thus, I have given some Reason, why there was so much debate about that general Thesis: The Brethren who were present at the debate, can, no doubt, say much more than either he or I could dream of; for there were many there who could have taught both him and me in these matters, or in any Theologicall Question. In wording of the Assertion, they were to look not onely to the salving of their Credit and Conscience among their Friends, who would candidly Interpret their words, but also to obviate the cavils of Adversaries, who were waiting for their halting, and would have been glad of any pretext to have rendred them odious to the Magistrate. The Historian goeth on in that 65 pag. upon that supposition, that the Assertion was thus qualified, to justify their accepting of these

these Rules, and upon this supposition, he infers, that then the cause sure was betrayed, &c. *uno absurdo dato mille sequuntur*. If ye will give him leave to lay a Foundation in the Air of his own fancy, he will build Castles in the Air; but it were a very idle work, for me to spend time in casting down these Castles, which have no Foundation but his false imagination.

Further (saith he) *I suppose it will be found, that some of these Instructions were indeed Formally and Intrinsically Ecclesiastical, and if these were excepted, they should have been particularly mentioned, that all might have been clear.* *Ans.* Then the addition of the words *Formally and Intrinsically Ecclesiastical*, to the Assertion, did exclude these, and all of that nature, and so was added to good purpose; and why then would he not have subscribed this Paper, or used it for a directory? Was it the worse that it did directly exclude these Rules, which did intrench most upon the Ministerial Office? If he say, that the excepting of these, was an accepting of the rest: I Answer, He grants, that Mr. B. refused all, and that Mr. H. said the same upon the matter, with Mr. B. and therefore all were refused. The confinement with all the rest of the Injunctions, was spoken against by Mr. H. as Impositions burdening their Ministry, and Reasons given why their Ministry should not be burdened with these Impositions. And the addition of the foresaid words, was no ways destructive to the words that Mr. B. spoke to the Chancellour; for if Mr. B. had thought them to be so, he would never have acquiesced to them, in the meeting, nor have acknowledged after-

terward, that Mr. *H.* spoke his mind; and therefore if the words, as spoken by Mr. *B.* were an honest Testimony, then Mr. *Hutcheson's* words, which were the same, and more ample, were an honest Testimony; but enough of this before. And thus we see, that the horrible horned Argument, with which he so terribly threatned these Brethren, hath done no hurt, but to himself; he hath raised dust, which hath blinded his own eyes, and exposed himself to the laughter or pity of the beholders: And it is really a great pity, that he who was fit for better work, should have so abused himself, and wasted his precious time, in passing judgment against his Brethren, who were Judicious and Conscientious Ministers, as men who after a long Debate, concluded, that which was nothing to the purpose or a betraying of the Cause: And instead of evident Reasons to confirm this Charge, bringing nothing but falsehoods and ridiculous Fopperies.

It were but a wasting of time, and an abusing of the Readers patience, to go through all his jumbings against the Informer; for many things in his Answers are nothing to the purpose in hand.

His insinuation, pag. 65. *That the Lord was away from these Brethren, and so Light and Counsel could not remain with them,* is full of Insolent boldness and rashness; he ought in Charity to have supposed that these Brethren were met in Christs name, and that the Lord was in the midst of them, and with them. If he had considered what he says in the end of that page, and beginning of the next, of the inconsiderableness of one or two abandoning the rest of their Brethren, it might have made him
and

and his Colleague a little more modest in their singular and extravagant conceits so contrary to the sentiments of the Suffering Ministers of the Church of Scotland. He alledges, pag. 66. *That they who were not clear for giving in a subscribed Paper to the Council, could not be very clear, as to the matter of the Paper*: The proof of this is in a *Parentthesis*, (I judge) *ipse dixit*; and so all is sure, and the Reader must acquiesce, it's *res judicata*, and so there is no more place for Debate. His thinking strange that these Ministers could not do that which he thinks every Minister and Servant of Christ should be ready to give, upon less than a few hours warning, yea, at the first demand, makes me apprehend, he hath not well understood the difficulty of ridding Marches, betwixt Magistrates and Ministers. He who thinks that any Servant of Christ, can at demand, and off hand, decide that Question, *de finibus*, does not understand it, or else he is a man of great abilities, and withal so Charitable, as to think every Minister as able as himself. If I had been upon the Historians Counsel, I would have advised him, to have forborn the Imprecation which he hath, pag. 67. §. 4. and that for his own sake; for if he by other papers, and by this History, hath not administered fuel to this fire, very many are much mistaken. Page 68. he inveighs much against Mr. H. for not speaking sooner, and not insinuating Reasons, why they could not in Conscience accept of these Impositions; but he himself hath cleared Mr. H. for before these papers were delivered, Mr. *Hutcheson* gave an honest Testimony against these Impositions, for he said the same, upon the matter, which

which Mr. B. said, which the Author commends as an honest Testimony. And pag. 70. proves that there was upon the matter no difference between Mr. H. and Mr. B's words. Page 71. he wrongs the Informer, in alledging that he gives to the Magistrate a diatactick power in an illimited and unqualified manner, as he doth (saith the Historian) when he talks of the diatactick power of both; for this is a manifest homologating of the Supremacy, as lately explained by the Parliament: For the Informer speaks not of the manner of the Magistrates diatactick power at all, and much less of an illimited manner of his power. The Author hath in the beginning of this page, blamed the Informer, for putting one term more than he should in a Syllogism, and yet I find not that Logical escape in the Informers paper, which I have, and if the Informer be the Person whom I take him to be, he can make a Syllogism as well, if not better than the Author of the story could. But I wonder, how he who blamed the Informer for putting one term more than enough in a Syllogism, should add two terms of his own to the Informers words, and then conclude from terms of his own making, a manifest homologation of the Supremacy, as lately explained in the Act of Parliament: This is not fair, but very foul dealing. The Informer saith onely, that the Magistrate hath a diatactick power, and the Author of the Answer to the History of the Indulgence very rationally sheweth, that all power of Government is diatactick; so that if the Magistrate have any power of Government about things Sacred, he must have a diatactick power. But to Reason thus.

he who ascribes to the Magistrate a diatactick power, ascribes it to him in an illimited, and unqualified manner, and homologates the Supremacy, as lately explained by the Parliament. But the Informer ascribes to the Magistrate a diatactick power, and therefore he ascribes it in an illimited manner, &c. and therefore, &c. is to reason without any shadow of Reason; for there is a manifest difference, and no appearance of identity betwixt a power diatactick and the illimited manner that he speaks of, *res differt à modo rei & præcipue à modo illimitato hoc est à modo, qui modum nescit*. Neither the word power, nor the word diatactick, nor both of them joyned together, do import an illimited boundless manner, and to infer from the term diatactick, illimitedness, is to draw confusion, out of Order, and *quidlibet ex quolibet*. I wonder that the Author did not alledge also, that the Informer ascribed this illimited, unqualified manner of diatactick power, and a Spiritual Supremacy, to Church Judicatories; for he ascribes this diatactick power to these also, and hath not the least insinuation, that he ascribes it in an illimited manner to the Magistrate, but in a limited to them. But the Author hath been in an ill humour, and ill humours makes ill Arguments: Passion prompts men to make Reproaches, but hath no patience to make Syllogisms, or to take leisure to examine, whether they be right or wrong: It disfigures both body and mind, and puts men in an ill mood, and therefore it's no wonder, if it keep neither mode nor figure, in Reasoning. Page 171, 172. he takes upon him to be an Instructor to the Informer; but the Informer knew as well as himself,

ſelf, if not ſomewhat better, that the Magiſtrate
 hath no Power to make Rules *Formally Eccleſiaſti-
 cal*, for that is the work of Eccleſiaſtical Govern-
 ours, nor to give injunctions, or commands, which
 are not good to Miniſters; but after all his Inſtructi-
 ons, the Informer, I ſuppoſe, would have inquir-
 ed at him, if the Magiſtrate, when it is needful,
 may not command lazy Miniſters to be diligent in
 the work of the Miniſtry; if he be certainly in-
 formed, that Popiſh Emiſſaries are ſent in among
 his Subjects, to poiſon them with Error and Idola-
 try, may he not command the Miniſters of his Do-
 minions, in their Doctrine, and Catechiſing to guard
 the People againſt Popery; if he find ſome preach-
 ing for the Worſhip of Images, or miſpending the
 time in repeating *Greek* and *Latine* Sentences to ig-
 norant People, who knows neither *Greek* nor *La-
 tine*, may he not diſcharge them to teach Idolatry,
 and command them to ſpeak in a known tongue?
 If he find ſome not obſerving ſome good and neceſ-
 ſary Acts of the general Aſſembly, may he not com-
 mand them to obſerve theſe Acts? May he not diſ-
 charge Preaching, in publick, in a general Muſter-
 day? I ſuppoſe, the Hiſtorian would not, if he re-
 membered the conceſſions of Orthodox Divines, and
 the Second book of Diſcipline, deny this to the Ma-
 giſtrate. Then the Informer would inquire, if Mi-
 niſters obeying of theſe Commands, were a deny-
 ing of Chriſt, to be onely head of his Church, or a
 receiving injunctions from an Uſurper, and a ceaſing
 to be Ambaſſadours of Chriſt. Is their doing that,
 which the Magiſtrate may Lawfully, and in ſome
 caſes ought to command, a crime of ſo horrid a na-
 ture?

ture? If it be not, then the Informer is where he was, & he will tell him, that then the Magistrate, though he may not make Ecclesiastick Canons, yet he hath a diatactick Power, or a commanding Power, to enjoin Ministers to do their Duty, and ought to make use of it when there is need: And to enforce these Magistratical commands, with Civil Penalties; as Ministers may, as Ambassadors of Christ, exhort Magistrates to do their Duty; so Magistrates, as Gods Vicegerents, may command Ministers to do their Duty, & yet neither Ministers may make Civil Statutes, nor Magistrates Ecclesiastick Canons or Rules.

The Arguments by which he would perswade the Indulged Ministers, in the end of *pag. 72* and *pag. 73*. not to Preach in the Parishes to which they were confined, would conclude, if they concluded any thing, that *John* should not have exercised his Ministry in *Patmos*, nor *Paul* in his hired House at *Rome*, for they were declared no free Subjects, and were under the scandal, as he calls it, of disloyal and censured persons: And this exposed them, and their Ministry to contempt in the World; but this did not render their pains fruitless, as he alledges *Paul's* bonds were to the furtherance of the Gospel, *Philip. 1. 12, 13, 14*. I wish the Author and some others had not been too like to these, who added affliction to *Paul's* bonds. I wish that all concerned, may examine, whether there hath not been Preaching and Writing, out of strife and envy, and contention. After all he hath said, about Ministers confinement, it is but too clear, even from what he grants, that their confinement is an extrinick, local restraint of the exercise of their Ministry. In that *73 pag.* he grants
again,

again, that Mr. *H.* spoke the same upon the matter with Mr. *B.* and that another said, that divers Ministers (the Brother who hath Answered this History, who was present, saith, it was the rest of the Ministers) of that company, were upon the matter of Mr. *B.*'s judgment, whereof himself was one; and the answerer adds, that one said, with an audible voice, *I adhere to what Mr. B. hath spoken.* And another added, *That one of these Rules did bring Ministers into a direct subjection to Prelacy contrary to their Principles.* And after he hath observed, that the consternation was not so universal, as the Informer did hint, (the Informer did speak of affliction of Spirit, but universal consternation was minted by himself, but not hinted by the Informer) he says, he passes these small matters, and is that a small matter, that the rest of these Ministers, were upon the matter of Mr. *B.*'s judgment, &c. But any thing which was so manifestly right, in these Brethren, that he knew not what he could say against it, he passes it as small, and makes nothing of it. But I wonder with what face or Conscience, he could call these Brethren, who in the face of the Council did homologate what Mr. *Blair* said, Mr. *B.*'s deserting Brethren, *pag.* 54. where he says, Mr. *B.* was rescued from the reproaches of his deserting Brethren. O the mischievous efficacy of prejudice and passion, in perverting not only mens minds and sayings, but their studied deliberate writings, designed for the Press! This should put all, to be much in Praying, that they be not led into temptation. And *pag.* 53. he says they left Mr. *B.* alone; did they leave him alone before the Council,

cil, when they, according to the Authors own confession, spoke the same upon the matter, and declared they were of his judgment? Or does he design to render them odious, because they left Mr. B. in Prison? Would he have had them imprisoning themselves, and deserting their Paroches, and the exercise of their Ministry, because Mr. B. was imprisoned? Had there been either Knowledge, or Conscience in shutting up themselves in Prison with Mr. B. but any thing will furnish matter of Accusation to an angry and prejudiced Person. Page 74. he again brings out a horned Argument against Mr. H. *Who, he says, by Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical, meant either the Rules which were then offered to Mr. B. or some other.* I Answer, he meant both these Rules and all other of the same nature; and so his two horns are turned into one. He goes on: *If some other, then he could not desire their Lordships not to misunderstand Mr. B. for Mr. B. meant and spoke of the Rules, which were tendred to him.* *Answ.* No doubt he spoke of these which were tendred to him, but any body that reads Mr. Blairs words, will see that Mr. B's. words are more universal, than to relate onely to these Rules; for, he says, he could receive no Rules, &c. He adds; *Nor could he then be supposed to be speaking any thing in favours of Mr. B. whether by way of Apology, Defence, or Explication.* *Answ.* He is far mistaken in his supposition; for what Mr. H. said against all Rules of that nature, was a justifying of Mr. B. refusing of these Rules, and all of that kind; any such, as Mr. H. words it, he justified the refusal of all Rules of the Magistrates making and
impo-

imposing, which did intrench upon Ecclesiastical Authority : And thus, he both defends and explains Mr. *Blairs* Speech ; and gives a Reason, why their Lordships could not make such Rules, because they were intrinsically Ecclesiastical, and so the making of them was the intrinsick and formal exercise of the Ecclesiastical Authority of Church-Officers. He adds another Reason, *That in these matters, which were the exercise of their Ministry, they were the Servants of Christ ; and therefore the Magistrate should not impose upon them, in these matters.* The Author grants, that some of these Rules were formally Ecclesiastical, which the Magistrate could not make, and all of them are burdensom impositions, clogging the exercise of the Ministry. The enjoying the Religious observation of the 29th. of *May*, by commanding cessation from work, and affixing a special kind of Worship to that day, was contrary to the Principle of these, who think none can make Holy-days but God ; the discharging of the Lecture, the reading and giving the sense of Scripture, was not to Edification, but an impeding of a mean of Edification ; the referring causes, from Sessions to Presbyteries, as now constitute, was contrary to the Principle of Presbyterians, who cannot put themselves in a subordination to Prelacy ; the restraining Ministers from Baptizing Children of other Congregations, &c. though formerly it did well, yet did not quadrate with the present state of the Church ; the injunction to have the Communion in one day, was impracticable ; the confining Preaching to Kirks, hinders Ministers from Preaching in several other parts of their Paroches, where

Preaching

Preaching is sometimes very requisite upon week-days, and renders the Celebration of the Communion in some places impracticable, when People will not go out from the Tables except there be Preaching without, and they were burdensome; and hindred Ministers from making full proof of their Ministry, in being an occasion of stumbling, to People, who not knowing how to distinguish, betwixt the Indulgence, which was a permission to Preach, and these impositions, nor knowing how to put a difference betwixt prescribing of these Instructions, and accepting of them, did take up prejudices, first against these Ministers, and then against their Ministry and the Ordinances dispensed by them, and some of them went that length, to make it their work, to render these Ministers and their Ministry contemptible, and to count it Service to God, to despise his Servants, and to hinder the work of their Ministry: And if the very prescribing of these Rules, had such effects, what would the acceptance and observance of them have done? Mr. *H*'s. words uttered before the Council, excludes all the Magistrates impositions, upon Ministers, in the matters of their Ministry, and so excludes these Instructions, which were impositions of that nature; and all impositions of that nature, even the confinement, is comprehended, which did restrain the exercise of their Ministry, and tended to hinder them from making full proof of their Ministry: The denying to the Magistrate a formal Ecclesiastical Power, excludes the Magistrate from all Acts, which are the formal exercise of Ecclesiastick Functions, and so from making Ecclesiastical

Canons, or Rules, formally Ecclesiastical. Again, in asserting, that Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical, given by the Magistrate, are impositions, he shews, that the Magistrate hath not a warrantable Power, to make, and impose such Rules upon Ministers. And in asserting, that they were the Servants of Christ, in the matters of their Ministry, he did shew that they could not be ruled by the Magistrates will or pleasure, in these matters; but behoved to be ruled by his will, whose Ministers they were; and that therefore they could not accept of and receive any Rules of the Magistrates making, or imposing, which would either hinder or marr their Masters Service; and the acceptance of which, would any way hinder them from making full proof of their Ministry, or marr them in doing these matters, in which they were not the Magistrates Servants, but Christs. These things are imported clearly in, or clearly follow from Mr. *H*'s. words, and they do manifestly exclude all encroachments of the Magistrate upon the calling of the Ministry, and its exercise, and so explains and confirms Mr. *B*'s. words, in their genuine sense. He goes on: *If he meant (saith the Historian) the same Rules, &c. then he confirms Mr. Blairs Argument.* *Ans.* So he does; he both clears what he said, and confirms it: He clears, in shewing that the Rules, which they and Mr. *B*. could not receive, were Rules made and imposed by the Magistrate, for Regulating Ecclesiastick Canons, Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical of the Magistrates making, and the enjoyning of which to Ministers, was an imposition. And besides Mr. *H*'s. words do more clearly obviate exceptions and objections

objections, than Mr. B's. do (though Mr. B's. words, taken in their genuine and native sense, and the sense which Mr. B. took them in, and be not wrested, are clear enough. For Instructions and Instructions to Regulate and to Regulate Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, sounds at the first hearing to all, who have but common sense of matters of that nature, Ecclesiastical Canons, or Canons formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, which the Magistrate should not form and impose.) For if any should Object. 1. May not the Magistrate (according to what is said in the first Chap. of the second Book of Discipline) command Ministers to Preach, Baptize, Exercise Discipline, according to the Rule of the Word of God? *Ans.* No doubt; but the Rule of the Word of God, is not a Rule of the Magistrates making, and his enjoyning Ministers to observe the Rule of the Word, in the exercise of their Ministry is no imposition upon them, nor does that command of the Magistrate any way hinder, but further the Service of Christ. *Object.* *May not the Magistrate enjoyn Ministers to observe the Acts of a Synod, which he hath ratified by his Civil Sanction?* *Ans.* These Canons or Acts, are not formed by the Magistrate, but by the Synod. *Obj.* *May not the Magistrate form Acts of the same nature with these, that general Assemblies and Synods form, for Regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry?* *Ans.* That were to confound the Office of the Magistrate with the Office of the Minister, and to bring the Magistrate in upon the calling of the Ministry, to elicit and exercise Acts which are intrinsically Ecclesiastical: It belongs in-

trinsically to the Office of Ministers of the Church, to explain and apply the Word of God, and these Ecclesiastick Rules, must be drawn from the Word of God; the forming of such Canons, hath in all Ages, been looked upon, as the work of Ecclesiastical Synods, who had no Power of the Sword, and therefore that work is the exercise of the Spiritual Keys, and not of the Civil Sword. As the forming of Rules of Physick, and forming Medicinal Receipts, is intrinsical to the faculty of Physick; so is the forming of Ecclesiastick Canons, intrinsical to the calling of the Ministry. *Obj. May not the Magistrate interrupt the Preaching, though on the Sabbath, when an Enemy is coming to Assault the Town, and call the People from the Church, to the Walls of the City to defend it.* *Answ.* That is no burdensome imposition upon the Minister, in the exercise of his Ministry, it's a work of Necessity, and the Lord declares his mind, that in such cases he will have mercy and not sacrifice. *Obj. May not the Magistrate make a general Muster through all his Dominions in one day of the week, and discharge Publick Sermon upon that day?* *Answ.* That is no imposition prejudging the Service of Christ, for Ministers may Preach, as conveniently, and readily more conveniently, upon any other day of the week.

It pertains to the Magistrate to make Laws and Constitutions, for the advancement of the Kirk, and Policy thereof, without Usurping any thing that pertains not to the Civil Sword, &c. 2. *Book of Discip. Chap. 10.* cited, if I remember before, the Magistrate should make Laws for advancement of

of Church-Policy, but not for its detriment; his Power about Church matters is cumulative not destructive: And if he should not make Civil Laws, prejudicial to the Policy of the Church, far less should he make Ecclesiastick Canons, and Canons that would be hurtful, though they were formed by a Church Judicatory; for here there are two faults:

1. Taking on him to do, what belongs to Ecclesiastick Courts. 2. Making Rules which upon the matter, hinders Ministers from making full proof of their Ministry. In his 2. he quarrels at the terms, intrinsically and formally, as general and not obviously intelligible, nor understood by every one. *Ans^w*. These are terms ordinarily made use

of by Orthodox Divines in matters of this nature: They are special and specifick terms, and distinguish Ecclesiastick Rules from these Civil Laws and Constitutions, which are intrinsically and formally Civil, but are extrinsically and objectively conversant about Ecclesiastick matters. Now we heard from the 10 Chap. of the 2^d. Book of Discipline, that it pertains to the Magistrate to make Laws and Constitutions, according to the Word of God, for advancement of the Kirk and Policy thereof. What he says in the end of pag. 74. about the Imprisonment and Confinement of a Ministers Person, that it is wholly Political, and no more Ecclesiastical than any other thing which concerns a Ministers Person, as his Hat, Books and Clothes, and the like. This shews, that the Ministers, who simply refused to receive Rules and Instructions formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, and distinguished these from such Political Acts, as the Confinement,

in refusing of which they were not so peremptory, but would observe or not observe them, as they judged of them, in their Conscience upon their peril, did in this Act very rationally. That Hats, Clothes and Books, do immediately concern a Ministers Person, are terms not obviously intelligible, every one doth not understand, how these do immediately concern a Ministers Person; he who would have others speak, as every one may understand, should have spoken more plainly, to make Ministers Clothes wholly Political, without any distinction, was a little kittle; but it's like he hath not had mind of Surplices, &c. when he wrote this. He adds, *Or will Rules made concerning the length of time which a Minister is to spend in the exercise of this or that Act of his Ministry, or the like, be accounted Rules extrinsically and materially Ecclesiastick*; as to such Rules, he says, pag. 75. *It is a Question, if Magistrates may either solely, or in prima instantia, prescribe such Rules to Ministers, however this being at best but dubious — and it (being to me at least) very uncertain, what Rules these are, which may be called externally and materially Ecclesiastical, I could have wished, that some instances hereof had been given, &c.* *Answ.* 1. If he would have dealt fairly, he should have used the ordinary terms, and not made terms of his own; for Rules *formally* and *intrinsically* Ecclesiastical, are distinguished from Civil Laws and Constitutions, *objectively* and *extrinsically* Ecclesiastical: And so his calling them Rules *externally* and *materially* Ecclesiastical, is a miscalling of them, that he may make a knot in a Rush, where he finds none. 2. If

an Indulged Minister had made a Question, if the Magistrate might limit the length of time which a Minister is to spend in the exercise of this or that Act of his Ministry, and had but doubted of it as a thing dubious, it's very probable that the Historian would have made this no less than a betraying of the Cause: He makes hideous outcries against them, upon as little ground. But seeing he himself grants that some of the Instructions, given by the Magistrate, were *formally* and *intrinsically* Ecclesiastical, *pag.* 65. He is as much obliged as the Indulged Ministers, to shew what are the Rules, which are contra-distinguished from these, they might be clear with him that some of these Rules were such, and why might it not be Lawful for them, as well as for him to doubt, concerning others of them. The Brother who hath answered this History, — shews, that the paper in which these Ministers agreed, would have informed him; and if he had been so desirous to know, he might have sent for it for his Instruction. But not to go further than the instance which he brings. If the Magistrate make an Act, if there be Sermon in a City upon a Market-day, that the Congregation shall be dismissed against such an hour, here is an Act extrinsically regulating or limiting the exercise of the Publick Worship; and if the time preceding that hour be a time of the day at which it is convenient for the People to meet, I see no cause of complaining or clashing with the Magistrate in that matter. But if the Magistrate should take upon him, to prescribe to the Minister how he should explain his Text, and in what method he should pro-

secute his Doctrines, that would be an intrenching upon the Calling of the Ministry; there are some things which are intrinsical to every Calling and Art, and Rules for ordering these, are to be drawn from the Principles of that Art and Calling; and the forming of these Rules, is the *formal* and *intrinsick* exercise of that Calling, and Art. And there are some Circumstantials that are so extrinsick, that they make no moral alteration upon an Action, but it may be every way as well done, and to as good purpose, with one of these Circumstances as another: As for example, whether the Sermon in a City shall begin upon the week-day, at eight hours, or half nine; and if there be two Kirks alike convenient, for the Congregation to meet in, it's all one, as to the morality of the meeting, whether it be here or there: And in such circumstantials as these, if the Magistrates Acts do not prejudice, impede, or marr, the exercise of the Ministry, Ministers have no Reason to complain, that such Acts intrenches and incroaches upon the exercise of their Ministry, or marrs them in the managing of these matters, in which they are the Servants of Christ. Seeing the Historian was so desirous to have this matter cleared, and thinks it is not cleared, by what these Ministers said, why would he not endeavour to Resolve this Question? And seeing he looked upon these Ministers, at least some of the ablest of them, as pedants, after he had removed them off the Field, and left it fair for himself, why would he not Triumph and glory over them, in teaching these pedants, and doing that alone, which they all could

could not do? and so Reign alone as the Basilisk doth, according to the Verse,

*Late sibi submovet omne,
Vulgus, ut in vacua regnet Basiliscus arena.*

But he is so far from being resolute here, from coming forward, as a Doctor *Resolutus*, that he sneaks away, *inter doctores dubitantes*; and yet I have no doubt that he could have said something to it, if he had liked; but his business there was not to distinguish, resolve, and clear confused, perplexed, dark things: but to render things, which were distinct and clearly resolved, confused, dark, and perplexed. And, I suppose, this History is one of the most confused, and to ignorant people one of the most confounding Books that ever was written upon matters of this nature. And I think upon tryal, it will be found, that one may learn more solid knowledge in the matters which this Author treats of, in reading a few lines of the confession of Faith, or of the second Book of Discipline, or of the course of Conformity, where these matters are handled, than from all that this Author hath written in 162 pages.

I come next to what he says, pag. 75. §. 2. to the other part of Mr. H's. Discourse, which was, *But for the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastical, whereby they might judge of matters of Religion, in order to their own Act, whether they would approve or discountenance such a way, he knew no Reformed Divine that did deny it unto them, and therefore desired, that his Brother Mr. A. B. might not be mistaken.*

mistaken. The other part of the Discourse, saith the Historian, is as useless, for any thing I can perceive, for clearing of Mr. B. or his Discourse. *Answer.* Some ill humours does vitiate and dis-enable some mens eyes, and their perceptive faculties, that they cannot see nor perceive what is very visible and perceptible. 2. Though this part of the Discourse did not clear Mr. B's. Discourse, yet it did compleat it, and so was not useless; yea, what compleats a Discourse which was defective, doth also clear it, as two lights joyned do enlighten one another, and the whole compounded of both, is more luminous. So truths which have connexion one with another, being joyned together, clear one another; he might have remembred, that some subjects of Discourse cannot be sufficiently cleared, except they be treated of, both affirmatively and negatively, and he who speaks both affirmatively and negatively of the Magistrates Power, speaks more clearly than he who speaks onely negatively: And he who not only shews what Power the Magistrate hath not in matters of Religion, but also what Power he hath about these matters, speaks more clearly, than he who sheweth only what Power the Magistrate hath not, but saith nothing of what Power he hath in these matters. And there was the more need of this, in the matter in hand, because of the question betwixt Magistrates and Ministers, of the bounds of their Power. And as these questions of marches are very kittle, because of Interest, so the ridding of marches, in the matter of Power and Authority are most ticklish; for Authority is a very tender thing, and it's scarcely to be expected, that any Person in
Power,

Power, will not be displeased with one, who speaking of that matter, tells onely what he may not do, but never speaks a word of what he may do. And therefore Mr. *H.* perceiving my L. Chancellour displeased with Mr. *B.* and having a clear ground to conceive that this was at least one thing that the Chancellour was displeased with, that Mr. *Blair* seemed not to allow to the Magistrate what did belong to him, which manifestly appears by my L. Chancellours questioning him, if the Council might confine him? To which Question Mr. *B.* answered, that he did not deny that the Council might confine him. Mr. *H.* I say, perceiving this, did very seasonably step in, to remove my L. Chancellours mistake of and displeasure against Mr. *B.* shewing, that though they could not allow to the Magistrate a Power to make and impose Instructions *intrinsically* and *formally* Ecclesiastical, yet all Orthodox Divines, and consequently Mr. *Blair*, was so far from denying to the Magistrate a power of confining, which is an Act, both formally and objectively Civil, that they granted to the Magistrate a Civil Power which was objectively Ecclesiastical, & therefore desired that his Brother Mr. *A.B.* might not be mistaken, as if he denied this, which all Orthodox Divines grant; and, as what Mr. *H.* spoke, was right and very full, as to the matter in hand, so it was very apposite, for shewing what was Mr. *B.*'s mind in these matters, and to remove mistakes; and thus we see that the Historian is much mistaken when he takes up Mr. *H.*'s words, as useless for clearing of Mr. *B.* or of his Discourse; for he clears Mr. *B.* to be of the same judgment with all Orthodox Divines,

Divines, as to the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastical; and this part of Mr. H's. Discourse, added to Mr. B's. assertion, as it was explained by Mr. H. by adding the terms agreed upon in the meeting, did give much light for clearing the sense of Mr. B's. words. Let us hear the Historians Reasons to prove the usefulness of Mr. H's. words. 1. Saith he, *There was nothing in Mr. B's. Discourse, giving the least hint of his denying that Power to the Magistrate, which all Orthodox Anti-erastian Divines grant.* *Ans.* That's true; but it is as true, that there is nothing in Mr. B's. Discourse, giving the least hint of his giving this power which is granted by all Orthodox Divines to the Magistrate. 2. It's clear enough that my L. Chancellour hath taken Mr. B's. words as a denial that the Magistrate had any Power over Ministers, which appears by his Lordships question to Mr. B. if the Council might confine him? Nor 2. Saith the Historian, *doth this piece of the Discourse, in any manner of way, clear in what sense Magistrates may give Instructions to Ministers to Regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry.* *Ans.* That's true; but it clears, that though Magistrates may not make Instructions formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, &c. yet they might make Civil Laws and Constitutions, which have Ministers and their Ministry for their Object, and so are objectively conversant about Ecclesiastical matters, about Ministers and the exercise of their Ministry. He adds, *That he cannot imagine to what purpose this Discourse was brought in, or what it was that gave the least occasion thereto.* *Ans.* This is very strange, for the Author had an imagination that

that was pretty fertile in other matters, and pretty sagacious, to find out the purpose of the Discourses of the Adversaries, whose Writings he examined. And the purpose of this Discourse was so obvious,

1. From the Objections of the Adversaries of Presbyterians, which alledge that they give too little to the Magistrate; and some of them are not ashamed to calumniate Presbyterians as if they gave as little to the Magistrate as Papists do.
2. From the touchy sense that all in Authority have of any thing that diminishes, or but seems to diminish their Power, or to derogate from it.
3. From my L. Chancellours displeasure at Mr. *B.* and his question proposed about the Magistrates Power of confining, and Mr. *H.*'s beginning and ending his Discourse with that desire, that their Lordships would not mistake Mr. *B.* That it's a wonder how a Person that had any imagination at all, could miss the purpose of this Discourse: But yet all these objective Evidences, which might have as Guides led his imagination to the true design of Mr. *H.*'s Discourse, were overswayed by two more intimate Guides, which, like ill Ghosts, haunted his imagination in the matters relating to Indulged Ministers, I mean his Passion and Prejudice, which habitually mis-guided him in these matters, and led him out of the right way, which was obvious, into extravagant phantasms and imaginations, which are so wild, that it's a wonder how any man who had but common sense to rectifie his imagination, could give way let be with-gate to them, or how he could suffer them to arise; or if they had started when he was not adventuring, how he could behold them without laughter

or

or indignation, but that he should have entertained them, and bewildered himself and his followers in following them, is one of the wildest Wild-goose Chases imaginable. There is one thing somewhat singular in this Authors imagination in these matters, that his imagination hath a habitual mishap of missing the right way, and taking the wrong. I do not remember of any Person to whom I can compare him in this, except one, who was a Servant to a Gentleman of my Acquaintance, of whom I heard his Master say, that when his Servant took the guiding of the way, he constantly mistook; when he came where there were two ways, he was sure to take the wrong way: which his Master having often observed, he resolved when there was any doubt of the way, never to take the way which his man took, but the way which he left, and so he was sure not to be mistaken. But yet I must give the Historian the pre-eminence in wandering, for that Servant took but one wrong way at once, but the Historian, when he hath prosecuted one wrong imaginary way, in which no foot hath trod before him, and followed it out, till he could win no further, he immediately comes back, and at the same pass where he began to wander he takes another wrong way, and then another, and so forth, till he hath wearied himself and his followers to no purpose; and which is yet worse, after all these wanderings, he never comes right. That Servant I spoke of came back to his Master to the right way, but the Author having no other Guide but his own imagination, miscarried by Prejudice and Passion, wanders habitually when he begins to guess at the

Indulged

Indulged Ministers meaning ; and upon a false imagination, that they meant something which never came in their head, he pursues after them in a way which they never took nor dreamed of ; and then to be sure to overtake them some way, he begins again, if they meant not that, they meant this ; and then again pursues, and so falses himself in following his own fancies, but for the true meaning of these Ministers, he ordinarily misses it, though it be most obvious to any who will not hood-wink himself. Any who looks but with half an eye into this Controversie about the limits of the Magistrates and Ministers Power, and into this business which was before the Council, will see that it was most necessary to add what Mr. *H.* added to Mr. *B.*'s. words, both for clearing Mr. *B.*'s. meaning, and for preventing the Objections that the Magistrate or others for the Magistrate might make against an Assertion which seemed to exclude the Magistrate from having any Power about Church Canons, or the exercise of the Ministry ; to which there was nothing added to clear what Power the Magistrate had in reference to matters of Religion. Might they not have Objected, Ye will, we see, take no Instructions from Magistrates, nor commands to Regulate the exercise of your Ministry : Ye will make Rules your selves for Regulating your Ministry, but ye will admit us to make none, for any thing we hear from you ? Ye ascribe no Power to us about matters of Religion : What, can the Magistrate do nothing for the Reformation and preservation of Religion, and for Reforming Ministers ? Is the Magistrate bound up, that he cannot hinder the making
or

or execution of wrong Canons? What if a Church-Assembly, a Council agree upon *Arrianism*, and resolve to Preach this to the Magistrates Subjects? What if they make Canons for Idolatry, for adoring Images, as the 2^d. *Nicen* Council did? What if they agree to publish the error of Transubstantiation, and to lift up the Bread in the Eucharist to be adored by the People? What if they agree upon a Church-policy manifestly contrary to the Scripture, and require the Subjects to subject themselves to be ruled by these Rules of Policy of their own making? Shall the Magistrate suffer his Subjects to be poisoned with Heresie, Idolatry, corrupt Churchmens Tyranny? Can he do nothing to hinder the making of such Heretical, Idolatrous, Tyrannical Canons, or to crush them, and hinder the execution of them when they are made? Must he blindly assent to all the Canons Kirk-men enact, and add his Civil Sanction to them, and see to the execution of them, that is to promote the eternal destruction of his own Subjects? Does not the confession of Faith allow to the Magistrate a Power for Reformation and conservation of Religion? And our latest Confession of Faith, though it assert, *Chap. 31. Sect. 3.* That it belongs to Synods and Councils Ministerially to determine Controversies of Faith, and Cases of Conscience, to set down Rules and Directions for the better Ordering of the Publick Worship of God, and Government of his Church, to receive complaints in cases of male Administration, and Authoritatively determine the same; yet it doth not assert, that though these Decrees be contrary to the Word of God, that they
are

are to be received by any, and much less by the Magistrate; for it's added in that same Article, *Which Decrees and Determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with Reverence and Submission, not only for their agreement to the Word, but also for the Power whereby they are made, as being an Ordinance of God appointed there- to in his Word.* And though that same late Confession, Chap. 23. Article 3. affirm, that the Civil Magistrate may not assume to himself the Administration of the Word and Sacraments, or the power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, yet he hath Authority, and it is his Duty to take Order, that Unity and Peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all Blasphemies and Heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in Worship and Discipline prevented or Reformed, and all Ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed; for the better effecting whereof, he hath Power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them, be according to the mind of God: Thus might they say, the Confession of Faith acknowledges that the Magistrate hath Authority for doing much in reference to the Reformation and preservation of Religion, but we hear nothing from you of any Power the Magistrate hath in reference to matters of Religion; ye onely tell what the Magistrate may not do in reference to you, and the exercise of your Ministry, and is this all the respect ye have to Authority? Now this and much more would have been Objected; and had not Mr. H. then very good reason to add this

second part of his Discourse? The Learned and Judicious Author or Authors of the Course of Conformity saw it necessary after they had shewed what the Magistrate might not do in matters of Religion, to subjoyn a Discourse shewing what they might do; and because the Book is not common, I shall transcribe somewhat to this purpose. Page 147, 148, 149. ye will see how tender they are in the matters of God, and how respectful also to Lawful Authority; they shew, *pag.* 147. that no man may command what he will, in any controverted matter Ecclesiastical. And then they relate this History, When *Alexander* the Great came to *Jerusalem*, he desired his Image to be erected in the Temple: The High Priest was willing to please him in any thing, wherein God was not displeased; and therefore refusing with all Reverence that Idolatry, what he might, and what served more for the Kings Honour, he offered chearfully; first to begin the Account of their times from his entry into *Jerusalem*; and 2. To name all their first-born Sons *Alexanders* from him. Then they add, What is Civil, what is Domestick, what is *Cæsar's*, what is ours, let them be forbidden Water and Fire, and their City sown with salt, who refuse it; let Christs Royal Prerogative, who will not give his Glory to another, be kept for himself: May we not in so narrow a strait, where we can see no way to turn, neither to the right hand nor to the left, open our mouths with the Obedient Assle? Have we used to serve so in other matters? Then they cite *Peter Martyr*, who shews, that if a Minister teach or administer the Sacraments against the Word of God, he is to be

be repressed by the Civil Magistrate, and yet not from him, but from the Word of God shall he seek the Rules and Reasons of his Function. And then they cite *Franciscus Junius* saying, 1. By what Authority or example is the Magistrate moved to think that the holy Kirk of God, and the simplicity of the Mysteries of Christ (whose voice alone his sheep know and follow, because the Father commanded that it should be heard onely. *John 10. 27.*) should be clothed about with humane Traditions. 2. To what end, thinketh he, must his things be sowed unto the Ordinances of God; for if it be that she may be conform to others, it were more equitable that other Kirks should conform to them, who come nearest to the Word of God, according to *Cyprian's* Counsel; not that they should joyn themselves to other Kirks: If it be that all things may be more decent, what can be more decent, than the simplicity of Christ? What more simple than his decency? If it be fulfilling of his own will, let it be so; but it must be remembered that the Will of God is the greatest necessity, and that the Kirk of God, in things Divine, is not subject to the will of Men, and what events may follow upon humane Traditions, as daily experience hath shewed. Then *Archippus* excepts, saying, You ever tell me what he should not do, but I would hear something positive of his Power in things Ecclesiastical, what he should, and may do in times of contention especially. *Epaphras* Answereth, That is not my part, ye know, yet this I may say, that as in the matter of Heresie, so in the time of Schism, for matters of Ceremony, the Magistrate calleth a Synod, representing the whole Kirk, having Power

definitive, and the judgment of Jurisdiction according to the Word, right as naturally in the Soul of Man, to make it plain by a comparison, the Imperial power of the Will, may command the understanding, quoad exercitium, that is, to pause upon a certain purpose, and to give her determination, but not quoad specificationem, that is, to assent or dissent, or to determine to the one side more than to the other; and as the same will hath actum elicited, as her essential, and most proper operation; and actum imperatum, produced by another power of the Soul at the commandment of the Will, as the Understanding to ponder and consider, the Appetite to exercise Temperance, Fortitude, &c. and out of her desire and choice of the Sovereign good of the Soul and Body, setteth all the Powers of Soul and Body to work; even so the Magistrate hath, actum elicited, in Civil Affairs, his essential and most proper Object. In the matters of Gods Kirk, whether for Order or Jurisdiction, albeit he hath not actum elicited, he may neither Preach the Word, nor minister the Sacraments, nor define by himself regularly; yet he hath actum imperatum, he may command Ministers to Preach the Word, to Celebrate the Sacraments, and to Convene and determine according to the Word.

Archip. And say you no more, is that all?

Epaphras. And more than this, he hath in all Ecclesiastical Canons or conclusions a three-fold judgment: One common, as a Christian; another proper, as a Magistrate; the third Personal, as a man singularly gifted. As a Christian, the judgment of Discretion, that he believe not or practice any thing of all that which the Kirk concludeth, if he find it

to be against the Word. As a Magistrate, he must have the judgment of his Vocation to discern what concerneth the Spiritual weal and Salvation of his Subjects, and accordingly to add, or suspend the Sanction. And as a singular Magistrate, having more than ordinary gifts of Knowledge and Piety, he ought to have such Interest in Determination and Jurisdiction with the Kirk as others who have more than ordinary gifts. Thus we see these Godly Learned Ministers saw it necessary to shew, not only what Power the Magistrate had not, but also positively what Power he had in things Ecclesiastical; and Divines generally who treat of these matters use to do so for preventing mistakes in so ticklish a matter. And therefore *Mr. H.* did as became a Godly, Learned, and Wise man, and a man who had a tender respect to Lawful Authority, and that from a Principle of Conscience. He speaks against all the Magistrates impositions which burdened their Ministry; he spoke against a Power formally Ecclesiastical in the Magistrate, against the Magistrates exercising this Power in forming Instructions intrinsically Ecclesiastical, for Regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, that the matters of their Ministry were Christs matters, and so not at the Magistrates Arbitrary disposal, nor at the Ministers disposal either, they being but Servants in these matters. And as he denies to the Magistrate that Ministerial Power which Christ hath given to his Servants, so he ascribes to the Magistrate that Magistratical Power which God hath given them; and so obviates the Objections and Exceptions formerly mentioned: For the Magistrates Power about Religion is summarily

comprehended in these words, the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastical, &c. And he shews, that the Magistrate is not, as Papists say, obliged blindly to execute the Ecclesiastick Sentences of Church-men, but hath the judgment of his Vocation, whereby he may judge whether he will approve or discountenance their Canons or Sentences, or any way or course that they take.

But (saith the Historian) as to the main business, I would further enquire whether the Brethren do judge the matter of giving these Instructions, about which the Debate did arise, did belong to the first part of the Discourse, and so to be intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical; or to the latter part, and so belong to that power of the Magistrate which is objectively Ecclesiastical: This Question must be judged necessary, unless that whole Discourse be accounted unnecessary and impertinent. Answ. 1. Whatever come of his question, the necessity and pertinency of the whole of Mr. H's. Discourse, is already cleared to any who will not shut their eyes against the light. 2. There is one of these Instructions by his own confession wholly Political, viz. the confinement; and therefore it is neither formally nor objectively Ecclesiastical (and yet it was spoken against by Mr. H. in his first Speech, it being a burdensom imposition in the matter of the Ministry) and so his question is not comprehensive enough, and if it be resolved into a disjunctive Assertion, it's by his own grant false. 3. If he apprehend that all these Instructions must either wholly belong to the first part of the Discourse, or all of them onely to the second part, the proposition is not necessary,
for

for some of them may belong to the first, and some to the second part of the Discourse, and yet all of them be burdensome impositions. *If the former be said (saith the Historian) then why was any troubled at Mr. B's. refusing the Instructions? Answ.* None was troubled for his refusing these Instructions, for they all agreed not to receive them. *Why (saith he) were not these condemned who had received them? Answ.* There were none who received them; if he think that the taking of them in their hand, was a receiving of them or accepting of them, this is one of his false imaginations: Will any say that a man who is unjustly Banished, or Condemned to die, does approve of the Sentence as right, because he takes it in his hand? The Author himself does not condemn but commend *Mr. B.* and yet he took them in his hand. He adds, *Why did not such as had received them cast them back again? Answ.* Because that would have been ill manners; the Author is none of the best of Historians, and I perceive he would be no good Master of manners; the casting of papers at Magistrates is no good cast of that craft; if he had advised them to lay them down civilly, with all respect to Authority, there would have been something of Civility here: But to cast papers at any Magistrate, let be at the Kings Councillours, is an ugly rudeness, that I suppose hath not been heard of where there hath been any shadow of Civility. Though the Magistrate had cast these papers at them, it would have been ill manners to have cast them back; but when the Magistrate very civilly delivered them to the Ministers, if the Ministers had cast them back to the Magistrate,

strate, it would not onely have argued unmannerly and absurd rudeness, but a manifest contempt of Authority. I think the Author did not cast back his Act of Banishment at the Magistrate: Some have better manners when they are before the Magistrates face, than when they are behind their back. But they who from a principle of Conscience honour Magistrates, will neither contemn them before their face, nor behind their back. Although this casting back the Magistrates papers was ill manners, yet it may be he thought it good Policy, that though it was Morally ill, it was Politically good, as *Athithophel's* Counsel was, and that it was subservient to the grand Design of the new Policy, which hath broken out lately in the late bond and *Sanchar* Declaration; for this casting back the Magistrates Papers would have been a mean pretty fit to have made an outcast betwixt Magistrates and Ministers, and a step to the casting off the Magistrate.

He adds another Question. *How came it*, saith he, *that all of them did not unanimously agree in this Testimony?* *Ans.* In what Testimony? That all these Instructions were formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastick Rules? But this, even in the Opinion of the Historian, had been to agree in a false Testimony; for he says, that one of them was wholly Political. And *pag. 65.* he does not say, that all of them, but he supposes that some of them were indeed formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical. Why, would he have had these Ministers agreeing in a Testimony, that he could not have agreed to himself? This is not fair, but false dealing, to quarrel with Ministers because they would not agree in a falsehood,

shood, and in a Testimony that he could not have given himself. He adds, *Or how came it that their common mouth did not speak what was the common Opinion of all.* *Answ.* Their common mouth spoke the Opinion of all, when he called all these Instructions impositions burdening them in the matters of their Ministry. He spoke also the Opinion of all, when he said, that they could not receive Canons intrinsically Ecclesiastick, &c. from their Lordships. He spoke also the Opinion of all, when he said, that though the Magistrate had not a Power formally Ecclesiastical, yet he had a Power objectively Ecclesiastical; and in these *Mr. B.* agreed with all the rest. He adds, *Why was it not more distinctly and in fewer words said, that they could not receive these Instructions, as being Rules intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical.* *Answ.* He himself grants, that all these Rules were not intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical: And why would he have them distinctly in few words telling a lie, and that which he himself thought false? It's strange that this Author hath such an habit of erring, that he seldom misses to miss the right way; it's yet more strange, that he who is so habituate to wander, hath so great confidence in directing others: but it's strangest of all, that he hath the confidence to direct them to go in a way which he himself counts wrong, and hath told them that it is wrong; that he will needs have honest men testifie that before Rulers, which he himself hath declared to them that it's false; that he will have them to tell that, which, if he himself may be trusted, is a lie.

The Historian goeth on. *If the latter* (saith he)

he) be said, then was not only Mr. B's. both Practice and Discourse condemned, but the whole Cause was basely betrayed, because under the pretext of the Magistrates Power Objectively Ecclesiastical, that, which is as intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical as many other at least are, was granted to the Magistrate: Will the Magistrates Power to act as a Man, and not as a Brute, in his Magistratical work about an Ecclesiastical Object, that is his Power to judge by the judgment of Discretion, which is common to all the Members of the Church; yea, to all men as men, which Papists deny unto Magistrates, allowing them onely to see with the Churches eyes, but Protestants grant unto them: Will this Power warrant them to give Instructions, &c? *Answ.* The Author having, according to his manner, mistaken his way in mistaking the manifest Design of Mr. H's. second speech, in both the parts of it; the further he goes, the more he bewilders himself; they say, an Error in the first concoction, is not afterward rectified. Mr. H's. design in that speech was to shew, that though Mr. B. did not grant to the Magistrate a Power formally Ecclesiastical, to make Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical, yet he did not deny to him a Power objectively Ecclesiastical; his wandring imagination, misled with Prejudice and Passion, hath put him to all these blind gropings in his queries and ifs. I suppose the Indulged Ministers have never said, that all these Instructions were the exercise of the Magistrates objectively Ecclesiastick Power, nor are they any way obliged to say it by any thing which Mr. H. said for clearing Mr. B's. meaning; but he would fain have them saying

saying something, that he might carp at it; and though they say it not, yet he says it, that he may have something to say against his own idle suppositions when he had nothing to say against *Mr. H's*. true and pertinent positions. But suppose that some of these Brethren did think that some of these Instructions were the exercise of the Civil Power objectively Ecclesiastical, as that first anent Marrying and Baptizing: I say, suppose that any of them thought that that Injunction could hardly be called formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, but objectively onely, because it is conversant about an Object which had been in former times Ecclesiastically concluded in Lawful Church-Judicatories; yet the thinking or saying so, would not have been a condemning of *Mr. B's*. Practice or Discourse, for all of them agreed with *Mr. Blair*, in refusing to receive from the Magistrate Rules formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical of the Magistrates making. Again, all of them agreed with *Mr. Blair*, that the Instructions which were at that time given by the Magistrate, were burdensome impositions upon Ministers, in the matters of their Ministry, which they could not approve: They looked upon the confinement which the Author counts wholly Political, as a grievous imposition: The Historian seems here to imagine that the acknowledging that the Magistrate hath a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, does oblige these who acknowledge it, to receive all his Injunctions which are objectively Ecclesiastical; but this is another of his false imaginations, for as the Kirk-Judicatories have often abused their Power, which is formally Ecclesiastical, in
making

making wrong Canons, as the 2^d. Council of Nice did, in concluding the adoration of Images: So doth the Civil Magistrate often abuse his Civil Power, which is objectively Ecclesiastical, in adding his Civil Sanction to, and enjoying the Observance of sinful Canons, Canons either in themselves unlawful, or Canons, which though at the time which they were made were very convenient, yet afterward through the change of the Constitution of Ecclesiastical Courts, and the alteration of Circumstances, becomes very inconvenient and prejudicial to the Church. So that though some of them had differed from others about the nature of some of these Instructions, whether they were the exercise of a Power formally Ecclesiastical, which the Magistrate should not have assumed; or the exercise of a Civil Power objectively Ecclesiastical, but abused and misapplied: Yet seeing they all agreed in this, that they were burdensome impositions, which they could not receive, and they were all agreed, that the Magistrate had not a Power formally Ecclesiastical to form Canons intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical: They were far from condemning *M^r. B's*. Practice or Discourse, and much farther from betraying the Cause. The most that he could make of this would amount to no more than this, that some of these Brethren might be mistaken concerning the Nature of some of these Instructions in thinking they were not formally but objectively Ecclesiastical; and must honest men, who minded nothing but Honesty, and who agreed together that these Instructions were bad, and not to be received, be charged with Treachery? Because they
were

were mistaken in a Question of that nature, which yet made no difference in their practice. But seeing he thinks that if any one of these Ministers had judged that all these Instructions were objectively Ecclesiastical, that then he would have betrayed the Cause; I shall give to him, but not grant, that *Mr. H.* judged all these Instructions objectively Ecclesiastical, and not intrinsically Ecclesiastical: Yet he could not conclude that *Mr. H.* had basely betrayed the whole Cause; for 1. Seeing *Mr. H.* did not declare this to be his judgment, he cannot be justly charged with betraying the whole, or betraying any part of the Cause; for causes are not betrayed by mens secret thoughts and judgings which they do not vent. The Author is very desirous to have these Ministers found treacherous, for when he can find no treachery in what they did, or said, he enquires after their thoughts and secret judgment, and upon supposition that they judged thus or thus, as he supposes, though they never vented their judgment, concludes their treachery. 2. Though *Mr. H.* had thought all these Instructions objectively, and not formally Ecclesiastical, yet *Mr. H.* in granting to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, could not be supposed to have granted to the Magistrate a Power to make these Instructions, because *Mr. H.* had declared these Instructions to be impositions, burdening Ministers in the matter of their Ministry. Now the Power objectively Ecclesiastical, which all Orthodox Divines, and *Mr. H.* with them, ascribe to the Magistrate, is that Power which God hath given to them for good, to the Church it's cumulative, and not destructive; the

the King of Kings, by whom Kings Reign, hath not given to Kings a Power to impose upon his Ministers impositions burdening them in the matter of their Ministry, and hindring and marring the work of the Ministry, in which they work the Work of the Lord, and are workers together with God. And thus, whether these Instructions were formally or objectively Ecclesiastical, seeing *Mr. H.* looked upon them as wrong, he can never be supposed to have granted to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical to enjoin these Instructions, and therefore though this were supposed that *Mr. H.* had judged these Instructions to be objectively Ecclesiastical, yet he could not be charged with betraying the Cause in granting to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical. Yet he will have them guilty of base Treachery, though he cannot prove it from any thing they did or said, nor yet from any thought which he imagined they had about the nature of these Instructions, but the Reader may readily think, that it is not possible for him to fasten the charge of betraying the whole Cause upon them, whose deeds, words, thoughts afford no Evidence of Treachery. Yet he will do it; the Reader who hath observed the mans disposition, will readily say, that he doubts nothing of his good will to render the Indulged Ministers odious: But he thinks it impossible to him to prove out of *Mr. H's* words, that they basely betrayed the whole Cause, seeing his words are the very words of Orthodox *Anti-erastian* Divines, when they speak most distinctly of these matters. But it seems the Reader knows not the mans might, and where his strength

in this cause lies, when he thinks this impossible for him to fasten this guilt, this horrid guilt upon so many honest men: What talk you of impossibility? He not onely can do it, but he can do it very easily, and that by a maxime which passes currant without any contradiction, a maxime that this Author makes much use of in a mister, and when other places of invention fails him the maxime is this, *Calumniare audacter aliquid adhærebit*, when all his why's, and how's, and if's have failed him, he boldly avers, that these Ministers, under the pretext of the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastical, granted to the Magistrate that which is intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical. That is, they first denied to him a Power formally Ecclesiastical, and then they gave it again to him in granting him a Power objectively Ecclesiastical; if ye say, that Power objectively Ecclesiastical is ordinarily when it's ascribed to the Magistrate contradistinguished from Power formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical. He will Answer, that if they had given a Power formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical to the Magistrate in plain terms, this had been plain dealing above board, but their conveying of it to him under a pretext and cover, that none would suspect their cunning conveying this intrinsic Power under the cloak of objective Power, their slipping the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven into the guards of the Civil Sword, or cunningly shoudering them together, and so delivering them both together to the Magistrate, this was indeed Treachery: And say what they will to purge themselves, yet do not ye believe them; for they who
have

have so basely betrayed the whole Cause, are not to be believed; or if ye have any Charity to believe them when they say they intended no such thing, yet be sure it was the intention of the work, though not of the worker, *intentio operis*, though not *intentio operantis*. And thus he hath proved that the whole cause was basely betrayed by a demonstration from the Cause, for he brings it in with a, because, under the pretext, &c. and so by a demonstration which they call *diſon*, the charge of betraying the whole Cause is strongly concluded *om̃es isti ſciſſat*. This Demonstration doth strongly conclude that the Author of it was strangely transported with Passion and Prejudice against the Indulged Ministers, but it proves nothing against the Indulged Ministers, but by virtue of the foresaid maxime; Calumniate boldly, and something will stick; for whatever was the nature of these Instructions, this is a manifest calumny that *Mr. H.* made a pretext of the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastical to grant that which was intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical to the Magistrate: For suppose *Mr. H.* had thought that none of these Instructions were intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical, yet in granting to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, he did no way approve of the Magistrates giving these Instructions, because he had designed these Instructions, ~~and~~ impositions burdening Ministers in the matter of their Ministry; and so whatever Power he gave to the Magistrate about Ecclesiastick Objects, he could not be supposed to yield to him a Power to make these impositions, and could no

whatis
which
sheweth
that
manifest

ways be supposed to have a design to grant to the Magistrate a Power intrinsically Ecclesiastical, which he manifestly denied, and to make a pretext of a Power objectively Ecclesiastical to cover this design: But whither will not Passion and Prejudice carry men when they are once engaged in a wrong Cause? For so long as they are under these woful distempers, they will make, ere they want something to say against their Adversaries. I think all who reads these things should be thereby stirred up to pray, that they may not be led into temptation. But whatever was *Mr. H's.* or *Mr. B's.* or any other of these Ministers judgments, concerning the nature of every one of these Instructions, I do not know, and therefore cannot determine; but I perceive the Author of this History hath not been clear himself; for if he had been clear to have asserted all the rest, besides the confinement intrinsically Ecclesiastical, he would not have failed to have done it in this place, and to have proved it with all his pith, seeing it would have concluded, as he thinks, the betraying of the whole Cause, which is the conclusion he would have been at with all his heart, seeing he makes so many fetches to bring it about; but when all is come to all, we see it amounts to no more but this: That that which is as intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical as many other at least are, &c. which clearly shews, that the man hath been in the mist as to the nature of these Instructions, for he does not say, that all these Instructions were intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical, or that any one of them was such absolutely, but onely that somewhat that was as intrinsically and formally

E c
mally

mally Ecclesiastical as many other at least are. But what if these many other which he means, be not intrinsically Ecclesiastical, for he tells us not what these many are, nor doth he tell us any one of these many, that we might compare them with the Instructions in question; and then his adding at least shews that he hath been in the dark in this matter, and durst not determine positively or particularly concerning the nature of all or any of these Instructions. He durst not determine which of them belonged to the formally Ecclesiastick, or which to the objectively Ecclesiastick Power, nor durst he determine that they were all intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical; and if he was in doubt himself, what wonder if there were doubts of this nature amongst these Brethren. And though I cannot certainly assert, that they had different apprehensions in this matter, yet I conjecture that there was something of it from what I read in an excellent Vindication of the Ministers who made use of the Indulgence, written, as is supposed, by that faithful and judicious Minister, Mr. *Thomas Wylie*, who was, as I am informed, present with these Ministers at their Meetings, though he had not then made any use of the Indulgence; for after he hath in Assertion 5. asserted, that it's granted without debate, that the Supream Magistrate hath a Supream Power objectively Ecclesiastick about Church-matters: And Aff. 7. That as it is the Magistrates sin to restrain Ministers from Preaching the Gospel, so it is condescended to by all of the Presbyterian persuasion, that it is the Duty of the Magistrates not onely to permit and allow the Preaching of the Gospel

Gospel in his Dominions, but upon supposition of neglect or necessity it is his Duty to command Ministers to Preach the Gospel. 2 Chron. 17. 7, 8, 9: *Jehoshaphat sent the Levites and Priests with the Book of the Law to teach all the Cities of Judah, and they went through all the Cities of Judah and taught the People.* Rom. 13. 4. *The Magistrate is to them a Minister for good.*

Mr. Rutherford, in his Treatise against Toleration, expounds that not onely of Civil good, but also of the Spiritual Soul good of his Subjects, which the Magistrate, as he is a nursing-father of the Church, and as he is *Custos utriusque tabulae*, is to procure by suppressing Hereticks and Heresies, and countenancing faithful Ministers. And some pages after, he says, by virtue of which Power (contained in the former Assertions) he may,

moving in his own sphere, and acting onely in a Civil capacity, give command that all things be done in the House of the God of Heaven according to the will of the God of Heaven, and even in the matters in hand it may by some be alledged, that the Magistrates fail is not in the Formality of the use of his Rules, but in the sinful and grievous matter of them. And then he supposes, that if the Magistrate had in the first Rule permitted and allowed Presbyterian Ministers to Baptize the Children

See Durham of Scandal, Part 3. Chap. 14. pag. 250. — Also by their negligence in not providing faithful Teachers, pag. 252. — To countenance with their Authority the Ordinance of Discipline, to confirm by their Authority the Ordinance of Preaching the Gospel. pag. 254, Magistrates might and ought to put Ministers, &c. to their Duty, in case they be negligent, &c.

dren of Persons in adjacent Parishes, and admit them to the Communion, if they were not clear to joyn with the incumbents who had conformed: And if in the second Rule they had appointed that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper should be as often yearly celebrated as the conveniency of the respective Congregations would admit; and had appointed that Congregations lying together should not have it on the same day, and allowed at such occasions Preaching without, and so of the rest: If they had put Ministers to their Duty, who would, or who ought to have quarrelled with the Magistrate, as out of his Duty? So it is not the Formality of the rise, or conveyance, but the faultiness of the matter, considering our present Constitution that makes the Rules sinful, and not to be practised by honest men. I may add, if the Magistrate had appointed the Indulged Ministers to meet Presbyterially, that cases which were formerly referable to Presbyteries might be still so referred, and not determined by Kirk-Sessions, I suppose none would have had reason to complain: And if it had been appointed that these Presbyteries should have Clerks, and pay them their dues, I suppose none would have alledged that this was *Erastianism*, but a restoring of something of the former Order. Something also of the different apprehensions of Ministers about these Rules, which of them were formally Ecclesiastical, and which mis-applications of the Civil Power objectively Ecclesiastical appears in the Answer of the History of the Indulgence, of which I spoke before; but that made no division among these honest Ministers, who looked upon them

them as impositions that were not to be received. And I suppose any who will impartially consider the matter, will think that these Ministers did wisely in forbearing to determine peremptorily concerning the nature of every one of these Rules, whether they were the exercise of a Power formally Ecclesiastical, or mis-applications of the Civil Power objectively Ecclesiastical. From what is said we may see the Vanity of all the Historians endeavours whereby he labours to prove that Mr. *H*'s. words were useless, or a base betraying of the Cause; and whatever Mr. *H*. thought of the nature of these Rules, he gave an honest Testimony against them, as the Author is forced to confess in acknowledging that he said the same upon the matter with Mr. *B*. but he spoke more fully and distinctly; for in his first Speech, which the Historian acknowledges to be the same upon the matter with Mr. *B*'s. he uses the words, impositions burdening in the matters of the Ministry, which comprehends not onely Rules formally Ecclesiastical of the Magistrates making, but also all Civil injunctions which impose grievous burdens. And I suppose it was Mr. *B*'s. design to refuse both, though his words seem most directly to relate to the former, and my reason is this, because the Reason which Mr. *B*. adds does clearly exclude all Arbitrary Civil injunctions which impose upon the Ambassadors of Christ, who are to adhere to their Masters Instructions in the discharge of their Office. And as Mr. *H*. shews, that Mr. *B*. did not intend to deny the Magistrates just Power, so the Reason which he adds justifies what Mr. *B*. said more exprelly, and what he meant, and clearly

enough insinuate by the Reason which he added to his Refusal. What the Author further adds, pag. 75 & 76. to prove that the granting to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, doth not warrant him to make Rules regulating the exercise of the Ministry and its intrinsick administration, is a very needless work, which his ignorant mistake of Mr. H's. design in speaking, and then his uncharitable, that I say not perverse, wresting of Mr. H's. words, and design against all Reason and common sense, hath put him to; as little wit makes meickle travel: So it is no wonder, if they who travel with such a mischievous design, as that is, to prove honest men to be base betrayers of the cause of God, be put to a great deal of pains in travelling to bring forth such a Monster, and to put some face upon such an ugly deformed Birth, and then to get it fathered upon them, who can give their Oath of verity they have nothing to do with it, and may safely say, that the Father of lies hath helped to breed it, and bring it forth.

I onely observe two things: 1. That in the end of the 75 page, and in the beginning of the 76, he mis-represents the judgment of Protestants, as if they gave the Magistrate no more but the judgment of Discretion, which is common to all Christians, and distinguishes Men from Brutes: He might have learned from the writings of Protestants, and from the course of Conformity in the place before cited, that beside the judgment of Discretion, they give to the Magistrate the judgment of his Vocation. 2. Page 76. He restricts the Magistrates consideration too much, when he limits it
onely

onely to the outward good, quiet, and advantage of the Common-wealth. He might have learned from the fore-cited place in the course of Conformity, that the Magistrate, as Magistrate, is to discern what concerneth the Spi-

See Durham on Scandal, Part 3 Chap. 14. pag. 256.

ritual well and Salvation of his Subjects. And from Mr. *Rutherford*, in his Treatise of Toleration, that the Magistrate, as Nurse-father of the Church, and *custos utriusque tabulae*, is not onely to procure the Civil good, but the Spiritual Soul-good of his Subjects. See also Mr. *Rutherford's* Divine right of Church-Government, pag. 550. Chap. 24. §. 20. Assert. 4. Where he says, *That the Magistrate, de jure, is obliged not onely to permit, but also to procure the free exercise of the Ministry — and to procure the good of the Souls of the Subjects.*

I am sensible that I have insisted too long in following the Historian in his rovaries and blind gropings, the Author who hath answered his whole Book sufficiently, hath fully answered this part of his Book in a few lines, by shewing what was Mr. *H's* design and meaning in this second Speech, and then shews, that the Historian hood-winks himself, and then quibbles and quæries, this is the meaning of it, or that is the meaning of it, and starts questions that were never started by a man of Letters in this matter, and such as there were no ground for here; and having set up his own fancy, he beats it down again, that it might appear to the less judicious, that he was doing something, while as he was doing nothing to the purpose. This

is a full Answer, and all that these quibbling Discourses deserved. In the rest of page 76, and in page 77, we have eight of his Magisterial dictates, to which the Brother who answers him, sets down so many contradictory propositions, which is a sufficient Answer. He shews, *That the Indulgence which the Ministers made use of, did neither tend, nor was intended to carry on an Invasion of the Rights of the Church, or of the Prerogatives of Christ.* 2. He shews, *That it's full, and a fuller Testimony than that which the Historian so much commends.* 3. *That it's a plain Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of Scotland in that particular, according to former Engagements.* 4. *That it was candid, ingenuous, and pertinent.* 5. *That it was expressed in terms solid and significant, made use of by the ablest Divines, including the very words made use of by Mr. B. and commended by the Historian for a faithful Testimony: Ministers are not obliged to make every one that hears them capable to understand what they very clearly speak.* 6. *As it homologates Mr. B's words, and made up the defects of it, so it contained no dis-ingenuous reflexions upon Mr. B.* 7. *Though it was spoken with all due respect to the Magistrate, yet seeing a Power formally Ecclesiastical was denied to the Magistrate; and seeing they asserted themselves to be the Servants of Christ in the matters of their Ministry, and so obliged to follow the will of Christ, and not the Magistrates impositions in these matters; they excluded the Magistrate both from the formal and elicitive Acts of the Ministerial Calling, and from Arbitray disposal of the matters of the Ministry.* And 8. *The terms are so solid significant,*

cant, and so much in use among Orthodox Divines, that they cannot be alledged to give too much or too little in this matter, except the generation of Anticraftian Orthodox Divines be condemned.

Page 77. the Historian falls foul upon the Brother, who said, *He could not receive Ecclesiastical Canons from their Lordships, but as for Civil significations of their Pleasure under the hazard of Civil Penalties, he could say nothing to that: And upon another who did homologate this Speech.*

The Historian replies first merrily with the ordinary Preface of Courtesie, that what he was to say might not be ill taken. *But, saith he, under favour, this is secundum artem volatilizare densa & densare volatilia, a pretty whim wham good for nothing.* And then on a sudden he turns very sad and serious, and begins with an Oh. *Oh (saith he) a serious, solid, zealous Minister should have been ashamed to have substitute such whitty whatties in the place of a plain Testimony clearly called for in the case: But these two Persons not onely break their own Order, and might have occasioned some consternation to the rest as well as Mr. B's. speaking did, but also spoke indeed nothing to the purpose, and might as well have been silent.* *Answ.* He who prefaced for favour should have spoken more favourably, according to the common saying, *Ut ameris amabilis esto*; but he very quickly spits the courtesie in a bitter gyb, which he thought would touch a Physitian in the quick, as an Arrow taken out of his own Quiver; he would kill him with his own weapons: And because Physitians ordinarily love to speak *Latine*, he speaks in his own Dialect, *Secundum*

dum artem, &c. but under favour, though there be bitterness, I see not any Art, or any thing smart in this tart ill broken Jest. I perceive so little salt, either volatile or fixed in it, that it seems to me a very insipid piece of Drollery. If he design by these Chymical terms to put the complement of a Cheat upon a serious, solid, zealous Minister, as he afterward designs him, there was much sin in this sport; and the pleasure that is taken in doing what is displeasing to God, is but a sport for fools, and the end of that mirth is sadness; the casting of such fire-brands is a sport for mad-men, to compare the serious Speech of a Minister, who by his Calling is a worker together with God, and a worker of the work of God, to the cheating operations of Alchymy, the product whereof is ordinarily some counterfeit thing, was a very odious comparison; and if this be the thing he means, then, as I observed before, that the Historian would have made no good Master of manners: So from this cast of his sporting craft I perceive he would have proved but a spur-galled sporter. When he speaks of a whim-wham he hath forgot the half of the tale, for if I be remembred, the whole of that insignificant tale is a whim-wham for a Goose-bridle; if I be wrong, the Children will correct me, the bridle was ill left out, it might have been good for something, if it had been but to have restrained the volatile things, of which he was immediately speaking, that they might not get away; for if ye hold not these subtil Birds by the head, it's folly to think of laying salt on their tail, if they once slip the bridle: And to follow them when they are flown, is the wildest
of

of all Wild-goose Chases; for if they once get out of your hand, ye will never more get your eye upon them again, let be your hand, for they evanish and turn to that which is next to nothing; and whether they be good for any thing or nothing after they are gone, I leave the Chymists to enquire, who are taken up with these whitty whatties, as the Historian terms them: But enough, if not too much of this. The Historians unworthy abusing of so worthy and deserving a Person, and his treating of so grave a Person in so ridiculous a way, did not deserve any serious Answer. If that Reverend and Learned Minister had spoken his mind in subtil evanishing words, having no sensible sense, or a sense not easily perceptible; or if he had used terms of Art, or words borrowed from Physick or Chymistry, or spoken *Latine* before the Council, there might have been some pretext for this ridiculous Drollery; but there is nothing of all these in his Speech. The first part of his Speech is the same upon the matter with Mr. B's. and large as plain, if not more plain than his Speech; and it hath this advantage, that it is more comprehensive: For Mr. B's. Speech doth onely exclude the Magistrate from making Rules to Regulate Ministers in their Ministerial Actings: This Speech excludes the Magistrate from making all Ecclesiastical Canons. Now there are many Ecclesiastical Canons besides these which Regulate the exercise of the Ministry: As for Example, If the Magistrate would make an Act that no Person should bring a Child to be Baptized by a Presbyterian Minister, or outed Minister, this would be an Ecclesiastical Canon, laying
an

an undue restraint upon Ministers who have Children to be Baptized, not in the exercise of their Ministry, but in that which is common to them with other Christians who have Children to be presented to Baptism. This Speech excluded this, and in general all Ecclesiastick Canons. The Historian alledges, that it was nothing to the purpose; sure he would not have said so of the first part of the Speech, if the second part had not been added. Now the addition of the second part was very much to the purpose for removing the mistake which the Magistrate had conceived from Mr. B's. Speech; and the words are in my Opinion more apposite than if he had said Civil Laws or Statutes; for the Instructions which he had an eye to in this part of his Speech, were neither properly Laws nor Statutes, such as the Confinement, and it may be the Act for paying the Clerks Fees. It's hard to find a more apposite and more short designation of Acts of that nature than that which he used, to wit, Civil significations of the Magistrates pleasure under the hazard of Civil Penalties. And if I knew not the Historians prejudice against Indulged Ministers, I could not but wonder that he makes such Tragical out-cries against so plain and apposite words. The Brother who hath Answered this History, in his Answer to this part of it, shews, that it was uncontroverted among these Brethren, that the greatest part of these Instructions were Ecclesiastick Canons. He shews also, that the paper offered to them by the Council contained Injunctions (one at least) of a Civil nature. The first sort are refused, the last he did not either directly refuse or accept,

accept, resolving to do as he should (all things considered) find best. What could be more plain or ingenuous? Yet, says the Historian, *i. by this distinction* (little better than a Mental reservation) *they might have scrupled at nothing that the Magistrate might attempt to prescribe in Church-matters; no, not at his giving Rules intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical, for these might also pass as Civil significations of their pleasure, &c.* *Ans.* His Parenthesis about Mental reservation, which is a Jesuitical Cheat and trick, confirms the suspicion that his *Latine* Sentence was a *periphrasis* of cheatry. The Historian could hardly have done the Author a greater injury than to have charged him with one of the worst of the Jesuits lying tricks; but his ingenuity is so well known to all who know him, that the Historians Tongue and Pen will not make this slander stick to him. The Historian might rather have alledged, that it was a piece of Oratory, an *Aposiopesis*: For the Person of whom he speaks is a good Orator, and they say, *Supprimit Orator quod Rusticus edit inepte*: But to make it little better than a Mental reservation, which even some Popish Writers, as *Scotus* and *Covarruvias* condemn as a lie, was a very injurious slander. They who make use of these Mental reservations speak that which is false, and which they know to be false, and think they shun lying by adding in their mind somewhat to what they speak to make it a truth; as when they are interrogate by a Judge, even upon Oath, if they spoke, or did this or that? They will swear, that they neither did, nor spoke it, the Judge hears no more from them, but then they think they have
not

not lied nor perjured themselves, because they have this thought in their mind, I did not say, or do this or that, to tell it to you who Questions me. So that what they speak is manifestly a lie, but what that Brother spoke was truth, and I believe he spoke the last words in great simplicity and singleness, as not knowing what he would do, when put to it by such Civil significations of the Magistrates pleasure, and so could not give any determinate Answer what he would do; he spoke like a wise and Conscientious man with great ingenuity. What would the Historian had him saying? Should he have said, I will Obey no Civil Acts by which ye signifie your pleasure, whatever be the hazard or penalty: Or would he have had him saying, I will Obey all the Civil Acts whereby ye signifie your pleasure: both these had been rash and unwarrantable Answers, which no Conscientious man who understands what he says, can give to any Magistrate who hath Civil Authority over him. And I suppose if the Historian had been in his case, and had absolutely refused to keep the confinement, or pay the Clerks Fees; if the Magistrate had certified him, that if he kept not his confinement, he would lay him by the heels in a Prison; and seeing the Magistrate did allow him the stipend, and yet he would not pay a little money at their command, that they would Authorize the Clerk to take him with caption. I suppose in this case the Historian would have been in some swither what to say or do, and would have taken some time to advise. And it's very strange that he imagines, that they who spoke thus might have scrupled at nothing; no, not at the Magistrates Rules

Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical; seeing they had expressly declared they could not receive such Rules. But, says he, *these may pass under the notion of Civil significations of their pleasure.* He might have as well said, that black may pass under the notion of white, and the Magistrate may pass under the notion of the Minister, and the State under the notion of the Kirk: For Ecclesiastical Canons, and Civil significations of the Magistrates pleasure were as clearly contra-distinguished one from another as these things spoken of; so that Canons intrinsically Ecclesiastical coming from the Magistrate to these Brethren, could never have passed with them as Civil significations, &c. except they had passed from what they had presently asserted in the Magistrates hearing, and to his face: And the coming of these Canons from the Magistrate would not have turned them into Civil significations of the Magistrates pleasure; for they had said, that they could receive no Ecclesiastical Canons from their Lordships. Now if their coming from the Magistrate had turned them into Civil Acts, and these Brethren had thought that the Magistrates giving of them would change their nature, they would have thought it impossible for the Magistrate to give any Ecclesiastick Canons, and so it had been a very ridiculous tale to have told they could not receive that from the Magistrate which it's impossible for the Magistrate to give; it had been just as if a man would gravely assert, I will drink no water out of the fire; for its impossible that fire can give water, and as impossible upon the foresaid supposition, that the Magistrate can give Ecclesiastick Canons, because

because his very giving them would make them Civil. It's as wild an imagination, that he thinks these Brethren by Ecclesiastical Canons meant only Canons framed and given by men in Church Office, as if they had said, we cannot receive from your Lordships, who are Magistrates, Canons which ye cannot give, because they can onely be given by Kirk-men, and your Lordships are not men in Church-Office. It's a foolish thing to follow the Historian in the rest of his Extravagancies. Pag. 78. He Argues as if these Brethren made no distinction betwixt the nature of Ecclesiastical Canons and Civil Acts signifying the Magistrates pleasure; and as if they had declared, that they would receive all which the Magistrate gave under the notion of Civil significations, and if ye will grant him these concessions (which are manifestly false, and contrary to the expresse words of these Brethren) then he will, *ex concessis*, prove that the Cause was plainly given up. I wonder much how such fancies could enter in his Head, but I wonder much more that upon his own groundless imaginations he could conclude such horrid flanders against honest Ministers. The Brother who hath Answered this History, after he hath solidly cleared these two Brethrens words, and vindicate them, he concludes. Thus our Historian here hood-winks himself again, and, like a Boy playing at belly blind with a bonnet over his face, gropes here, and gropes there, and makes several false suppositions, coyns several false senses, sets them up and dings them down, bravely and Orthodoxly indeed. What the Historian says, pag. 79. of these two Brethren, that they hinted by their

Answer

Answers and Distinction, that a Power formally Ecclesiastical is denominated so, not because it is so in it self, but meerly because it is exerted by Church-men, is manifestly false : This is a hint minted by his own prejudice and erring imagination, which was wofully habituated to such false and injurious imaginations. For the first part of their Speech, which relates to Canons Ecclesiastical, makes no mention at all of Church-men, nor speaks of any reference of Ecclesiastical Canons to Church-men ; they onely say, they could not receive Ecclesiastical Canons from their Lordships.

Page 79. The first part of Mr. H's. Speech ; which he resumed, as hath been often observed, does overturn *Erastianism*, and excludes the Magistrate from making Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical, whether for Regulating Ministers or Church-members ; for he who hath not a Power formally Ecclesiastical, cannot form Canons which are formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical. The Historians additional Answer is already Answered. As to these words which follow, *Intimating withal, that the Brethren would either observe or not observe their Directions, according as they judged of them in their Conscience upon their peril.* The Historian Answers, *And was this all? Is it all one at whose hands Ministers receive Directions, &c. to Regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry, &c.* I Answer, although the words as they are related by the Informer, who was not present, but did write no doubt according to his Information, will bear a fair construction : For if Mr. H. hath spoken as the Informer relates, I think it is more than
F f
probable

probable that he hath been speaking of the Councils commands in general and indefinitely, and I am confirmed in this from the words as they stand. The Brother who Answers the History, says, there were other things spoken beside what the Informer relates; and I am very much inclined to think that the speeches which passed betwixt my L. Chancelour and the Ministers, and Mr. H. hath carried Mr. H. to speak in the general concerning the Brethrens Obedience to the Councils Directions, that they would either observe or not observe their Lordships Directions as they judged of them in their Consciences upon their peril. I say, I am confirmed in this by the words as they stand, for he does not say these Injunctions, or Instructions, or Rules, which are the terms by which these Instructions were expressed: But he says Directions; and then he says, not these Directions, but their Directions, comprehending all commands which might come from the Council: If this was the thing he designed, there is no occasion of carping at his words; for no person can with any shadow of Reason say, that a Subject speaking thus to the Magistrate, *I will observe or not observe your commands according as I shall judge of them in my Conscience*: I say, none can say, that that Subject gives more than enough to the Magistrate. But suppose his words relate onely to these Directions, yet no Person of Candour can alledge, that they were undetermined as to their observing or not observing the Instructions, which they judged intrinsically Ecclesiastical; seeing they had declared to the Magistrate they could not receive these from their Lordships, that was a thing that

that they had judged in their Conscience already ; but the Confinement, and it may be the Act for paying the Clerks Fees, hath occasioned his Answering in that manner, not being peremptory as to such things, according as the two Brethren had said before that as to Civil significations, &c. But from what I find in other papers of Brethren who were present, whose words, none who know them will question. I perceive that the Informer hath not gotten full Information, for one of these Brethren relates, that the Brother who was chosen to make use of the paper that was drawn as a Directory for what he was to say in their name, upon supposition the paper with Instructions were offered, did in the face of the Council declare, that it was not in the Magistrates Power to make Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical to Regulate Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, and that their Lordships knew our Divines say so: To which my L. Chancellor answered, *Sir, we know what belongs to our Office as well as you, what belongs to your*. And as to my Lord Chancellours Answer, which contained a threatning to punish, I related before from the Answer of this History, written by a Minister who was present, that it was in these words, and no other, *Then, Sir, we will punish you.* Unto which Mr. H. did not reply in words, but onely in gesture; hence, says he, it's needless to debate upon things that were not spoken: Onely, 1. It's clear by my L. Chancellours reply, that he understood these Ministers as refusing Obedience to these Instructions, otherwise he would not have uttered these words. 2. That the Historians alledgeance

that the punishment threatned by my L. Chancel-
 lour might comprehend Ecclesiastical punishment,
 as he calls it, is groundless and irrational. The
 Kings Letter grants not to the Council the Power
 of inflicting Church censures, if the King had gi-
 ven them that Power to inflict Censures, they would
 also have had Power to take them off; but as he
 shews in his Answer to the first Remark of the Hi-
 storian on the Kings Letter, they sisted to Indulge
 some whom they intended to Indulge, till the Bi-
 shop had taken off the Sentence of Deposition. So
 that the Council did not pretend by virtue of the
 Kings Letter, to impose or remove Church-censures.
 And the Council knew that the Indulged Ministers
 would not submit to the Bishops Censures, and there-
 fore it's a groundless dream, that by punishment
 Church-censure is meant. He adds, That the Ma-
 gistrate might have commanded the Indulged Mi-
 nisters to inflict Censures upon themselves, as they
 used to do formerly in Presbyterial Courts.

Page 80. *We heard (saith the Historian) of Rules
 intrinsecally, &c. but we heard of no assumption that
 such were the Rules contained in the paper tendred
 unto them, nor of a conclusion, that therefore they
 could not, they might not in Conscience accept of them.*
Answ. The Historian hath not considered, 1. Who
 these Ministers were, they were not School-boys,
 tyed to the formalities of Arguing *Categoricè in
 modo & figura*. Nor 2. Where they were, they
 were not in the School, ingaged in a School-dispute,
 but before the secret Council, where formal Syllo-
 gisms are accounted pedantry. Nor 3. Hath he
 considered the part they sustained there, for they
 were

were Defendants, and if the Defendant deny and distinguish, he does enough; and if he give also a reason of his denial, he does abundantly. Now these Ministers acted all these parts very distinctly and rationally, as we have seen already. When the Apostles are brought before the Council, *Acts 4.* they get another manner of Injunction than any in the Act of Instructions; for they are commanded not to speak at all, nor teach in the Name of *Jesus*. This was an Instruction which tended to the destruction, not only of the Gospel-Ministry, but of all Christianity: This was one of the worst Councils, and this one of the worst Instructions that ever was; for this Council was gathered directly against Christ, and this Instruction was for the total destruction of Christianity root and branch, and for the total Subversion of the Kingdom of Christ, of the Church, the Ministry, the Gospel, and of all private Conference about Christ, &c. This was worse than any Sect of *Erastianism* we have yet heard of, let be seen, and yet the Apostles enter not in debate with that Council about the Councils Authority to meddle in such matters; they do not make Syllogisms against the Councils capacity of Acting, nor against the Act they had made; yea, they do not *in terminis*, say, they will not obey the Councils command: Nor say they, *in terminis*, that they would speak and teach in the name of *Jesus*. They forbear a direct and formal Contradiction *in terminis*, but they do that which was less irritating, but much better, and more for the Advantage of their Cause. Their Answer (which is in these words, *Acts 4. 19, 20. Whether it be right in the sight of*

God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard) is a real and rational refusal to do what the Council commanded, and the Council understood it so, and therefore threatned them further; and such rational qualified Answers, which are real refusals of wrong commands, are much more to the Conviction and Edification of all that hear them, than flat Contradictions not qualified with solid Reasons. When the Apostles come to their Company, they relate the matter, and they are well satisfied with their behaviour; they say not, why entred ye not a Protestation against that *Anti-christian* Council, that was not gathered in the Name of Christ, but against Christ, &c? Why did ye not in expresse terms say, that ye would receive no commands from them? Why said ye not in expresse terms, that ye would speak at all occasions, and teach in the name of *Jesus*, and so flatly, and *in terminis*, contradicted the Councils Injunction? Why spoke ye in such general terms of speaking the things that ye had heard and seen? Why said ye not, *in terminis*, that ye would obey God, and that ye would not obey the Council, and that the command of the Council was contrary to the command of God? Testimonies cannot be too plain, ye should have been more particular. Why did ye not frame an Argument against them thus, When the command of men is contrary to the command of God, then it is not to be obeyed; but your command that ye have given to us at this time is contrary to the command of God: And therefore we will not obey this your command. But these good honest Primitive Christi-

Christians, who were Acted by the Spirit of Love, were not so captious nor censorious. In the 5th. Chap. *After they had beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the Name of Jesus, and let them go.* We do not hear that the Apostles said any thing after they were beaten, against that new Injunction, but they had not a mind to Obey it, and they make that clear by their practice, for they ceased not to Preach *Jesus Christ* daily in the Temple, and in every House. The Disciples do not refuse to hear them because they had given no verbal Testimony against that last Injunction, or because they had not the last word; seeing they did really disobey that Injunction in Preaching the Gospel, they made no quarrel either at their speaking, or at their silence when beaten, they were glad that the Council had let them go, and had not shut them up in Prison, nor put them to death; they were glad that they were living and at liberty to Preach in the Name of *Jesus*. 4. The Historian commended Mr. B's. Speech, and yet he made no Assumption nor Conclusion; and why finds he fault with Mr. H's. Speech upon this Account, that he did not subsume and conclude. 5. The Author of this story could not have subsumed that all these Instructions are formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, for he grants at least that one of them was wholly Political, and the Brother who answers his History, says, that that Instruction about Bursers and Clerks is about *α τὸ βίωτικον*, a thing pertaining to this life, and of very small consideration, and no way regulative of the Ministry; a thing also that falls immediately and directly under the Superiority

and Jurisdiction of the Supreme Civil Magistrate, although for its remote and mediate end it have a Spiritual good. And it may be the Brethren had different apprehensions about some of these Rules, and so some would have subsumed more in the assumption than others, and this would have made a difference of their apprehensions manifest before the Council, which was needless, seeing they were all agreed that they were gravaminous impositions, and that these who were intrinsically Ecclesiastical, regulating the exercise of the Ministry, could not be received.

That the Historian could not understand to what purpose the Magistrates Power objectively Ecclesiastical was conceded except for justifying the Magistrates giving, and the Ministers receiving these Instructions, did proceed from his Passion and Prejudice, which blinded his understanding, as we have clearly manifested by shewing what was Mr. H's. design in that part of his Discourse. I suppose he as much mistakes the Informers design, *pag.* 81. In that same page he craves leave to add, that the Ministers Declaration was annulled by their receiving of the papers. We could not hinder him to make that addition, but we protest, that it may be added to the rest of his false imaginations, and so let it pass with the rest of his Errors; he hath forgotten that this condemns Mr. *Blair*, and annuls his Testimony, for he took the paper in his hand, which several of the Brethren did not. It's as false that the Power imposing these Instructions was so lightly passed; for Mr. *H.* declared, that the Magistrate had not a Power formally Ecclesiastical, and gave a solid Reason

Reason why they could not impose burdens upon Ministers in the matters of their Ministry, because they were the Servants of Christ, and so at his will, and not at the will and pleasure of men in these matters. The Informer will deny what the Historian, *pag.* 82 says, was hinted by him. I perceive by what the Historian hath here, *pag.* 81 & 82, that he can allow more to a Godly Reforming Magistrate, than to Magistrates that are open Enemies, and yet he hath granted before that all that agrees to a Magistrate as Magistrate, agrees to every Magistrate, and so he can allow more to a Godly Magistrate, than agrees to the Magistrate as Magistrate. Again, he grants, that in a time of universal defection and deformation, which can no other way be remedied, that Magistrates may give Rules and Injunctions to Regulate Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, for he grants that Godly Divines have granted this to be given to extraordinary and immediately inspired Magistrates, &c. Or they have granted it in a time of universal defection, &c. For the first of these concessions, that more may be allowed to Magistrates really minding Reformation, than to Magistrates as Magistrates: I would enquire what Warrant he hath for giving this allowance for these divers Weights and Measures to the good and bad Magistrate, in defining the limits of their Power and Office, as the Informer speaks. By what Rule gives he one grain of more Power and Authority about these things which are the matters of God, to one Magistrate, than God hath given to all Magistrates? The Power of the Magistrate about things Sacred is given and determined

mined by God, and is not to be enlarged and restrained by mens allowance or disallowance: This is kittle work, if the Magistrates Power about holy things may be enlarged by mens allowance, why may not Ministers Power in the administration of Holy things be enlarged also, and more allowed to eminent Godly Ministers, who minds Reformation? This hath been a pretext for Prelacy, and it will go far to make a Bishop. Again, how much more would he allow to Reforming Magistrates, when he hath once past the limits that God hath set, where will he stay? What Rule have we for setting bounds to this allowance in the matter of Power and Authority; the most part of men loves well to have *ulterius* for their Motto; must this depend upon the will of Kirk-men? But as the misguided will of Kirk-men set up an Ecclesiastick Pope, why may it not also set up a Civil Pope? If the goodness and disposition to Reform be the Rule, then the more a Magistrate minds the glory of God, he must have the more Power allowed. What if a Magistrate seem very Zealous for Reformation, till he hath gotten very much Power, and then he turn an Adversary; how will ye get back the Power which ye have given away? The Magistrate will not readily give Subjects allowance to take back what they have given. Again, how can ye fairly refuse to a bad Magistrate who succeeds to a good Predecessour what was allowed to his Predecessour? Such a refusal would be a great temptation to make a bad Magistrate worse. I shall not insist on this further, but the little that hath been said may shew, that it's much safer to hold that all Magistrates have

the same Official Power in reference to Church-matters; and that even *Nero*, as *Mr. Rutherford* says, had that, as all Ministers that are Ministers have, the same Ministerial Authority. And all Magistrates have in a time of defection and deformation the same Authority for reducing things to Order, when they can be no other way remedied. If an Indulged Minister had granted that the Magistrate might in any case give Rules and Injunctions to Regulate Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, which yet the Historian grants in a time of universal defection and deformation, which can no other way be remedied; it's very like the Historian would have charged them with the betraying of the whole Cause. I wonder that he who grants this to the Magistrate at some times, should have made such horrible out-cries against the Indulged Ministers, though they had done what he alleges upon them: He hath fore-seen this Objection, and therefore he subjoyns, *This cannot be applied to our Case*. But might not honest men be of that Opinion, that this was our case, and though mistaken in their Opinion, is that a sufficient ground to charge them with betraying the whole Cause? Our case looks very like a case of defection and deformation, and this Book of his hath helped on the deformation. He looks on the Indulged Ministers, and the Ministers who are for hearing of them, and those who adhere to them, as in a course of defection. But though at other times he makes a very general defection, and alleges that the outed Ministers who are not Indulged, are Acted by a Spirit of Antichrist, yet here he will not grant a defection or deformation,

formation, for fear lest he be obliged by his own concession to grant the Magistrate a Power of making Rules, and I suppose before he granted that, he would deny all that he hath said in other places, of the defection and deformation of the Church. *And further, says he, I wonder how he thinketh any can judge otherwise than that Interpretatively at least the receiving of these papers on these terms was a giving up of the right of the Church with their own hands.* But what if his wondering be, as ordinarily wondering is, the Daughter of Ignorance, O not so, his wondering is the Daughter of manifest Light, for he subjoyns, *Seeing it is so clear and manifest by what we have said.* And then he makes another Inference from the manifest clearness of what he hath said: And what is that? *And (says he) seeing it is so, himself (that's the Informer) will, I suppose, grant, that every Minister is called highly to resent this Treachery.* And thus he supposes that the Informer is turned one of his Profelytes, if ye will do him the favour to believe, without any Evidence, that all that he hath said is clear and manifest, he will bring you to believe that the Moon is made of green Cheese: He will set every mans hand against his Brother, and bring every Minister to account all that Treachery which he himself calls Treachery. But the Informer is none of these credulous Persons, to grant any thing that the Historian would impose upon him as clear and manifest, because he hath said it. What followeth hath been answered before; his mistaking of Mr. H's. purpose in ascribing to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, hath led him into many
 absur-

absurdities. Page 83. he looks on it as an absurdity to infer from the judgment of Discretion, which every private man hath to judge of his own Act about things Civil, to infer that therefore private Persons can prescribe Rules to Regulate Magistrates in the exercise of their Function; and he had good Reason to judge so. But the seeds of Sedition and Schism, of the contempt of Magistracy and Ministry which are sown in this History, and the Letter before it ~~in~~ the Cup of cold water, and ~~in~~ other Letters written by these Authors, have grown up so fast (for ill Weeds wax well) that they have brought forth a late Band and Declaration, Published at *Sanchar*, in which private Persons does much more, than the giving Rules to Magistrates and Ministers amounts to, for they in these papers exauctorates the Magistrates, and appoints their execution for purging the Land, and overturns the established Civil Government, and appoints a new one, and new Laws for this new Common-wealth, and they renounce communion with all who joyn not with them in these things; and will own no Ministers who differs from them for Ministers, till they stand in judgment before the Ministers who are of their way, which at most, for any thing I could learn, were but three, and two of them young men, whose Ordination was questioned. I hear now also of a new Excommunication which I have not seen. There is neither judgment nor discretion in these Practices, but a dreadful judicial giddiness, which should make all tremble and take heed of the first Seeds of Sedition and Schism, which leads to confusion and desolation. His granting,

pag.

pag. 83. to the Magistrate a Power about the same things wherein the Ecclesiastical Power is exercised in, so far as concerneth the outward disposing of Divine things in this or that Dominion; and then leaving it without explication to limit this outward disposing, is a concession that if an Indulged Minister had said it, all the explications he could have added would not have cleared it from a homologation of the Act of Supremacy. O, what Tragical exclamations would the Historian have made against them! This outward disposing of Divine things would have been made as much of as the Act of Supremacy amounts to. This Author hath been one of the unhappiest rider of Marches betwixt the Magistrates and Ministers that I have met with, for he is ordinarily in extreams, either giving too much or too little. In the end of pag. 84. he says, *That this Testimony was general, impertinent, confused, indistinct, and defective — and that there was much pusillanimity, dis-ingenuity, carnal consultation in it, and that it was a meer cothurnus, that is, that which may be turned any way.* Answ. It's strange that the Author who professes elsewhere, that Testimonies should be made much of, that he could make nothing of this Testimony, but makes it worse than nothing, even a betraying of the Cause. Seeing there were none who had said so much before the Magistrate by way of Testimony to the Truth, as the Indulged Ministers did: If he had not been much distempered and byassed with Passion and Prejudice, he would for the Truths sake have made as much of this Testimony as he could in truth, but he contrary to truth and com-
mon

mon sense, perverts and wrests it to turn it into Treachery. The Reverend Brother who hath Answered this History, hath shewed, that the Indulged Ministers had concurred with the rest of the outed Ministers, 1. In a real and practical Testimony, which consists positively in adhering to all their former Principles, Professions, and Engagements, and in practising them as far as was possible: And negatively, in keeping themselves free from every piece of defection, and from all impositions inconsistent with the truths and Institutions of Christ, their former Principles, Professions, and Engagements, which was *a bolding fast of their Profession without wavering*, Heb. 10. 23. *The keeping of their Garments clean*, Rev. 3. 4. And being faithful to the Death. This is the principal thing, upon the account whereof those who suffered in the Primitive times were called Martyrs, and the faithfulness of the Indulged Ministers in holding up this Testimony he clears at great length. 2. In a Doctrinal or Concional Testimony in Preaching against the evils of the Times, discovering and confuting them from the Word of God, and exhorting to abstain from them: *And herein*, says he, *the Indulged Ministers have not been behind with any other faithful Ministers, though they made not this the All of their work, having many other necessary Gospel-truths to explain, inculcate, and press.* 3. As for that third sort of Testimony, by way of publick Declaration in their own name, and in the name of all adhering to them, which is the proper work of a Church-Judicatory, and more formally of a general Assembly, or National Synod, and which

which hardly can be expected from the hands of a broken and scattered remnant, who hardly can meet together without great hazard ; he shews, that in reference to this, the Indulged Ministers have not been behind any Godly Ministers in endeavouring it. As for the fourth sort of Testimony, spoken of, *Matth. 10. 18. Dan. 3. 16, 17, 18.* the Indulged Ministers have done more this way than others in their respective appearances before the Council at the giving of the first Indulgence, and the appearance occasioned by their not keeping the 29th. of *May* : And any who will but consider what is Recorded and remembred of these matters, will see a very clear and distinct confession before Rulers of the truths especially called in question in these times. Consider their Declaration with a reference to these Questions, and this will be very evident.

Quest. 1. *From whom have ye received your Ministry?* *Ans.* We have received our Ministry from Jesus Christ. *Q. From whom have ye your prescriptions to Regulate you in your Ministry?* *A.* From Jesus Christ. *Q. Are these prescriptions full, or defective, so that other prescriptions may be superadded?* *A.* These prescriptions are full. *Q. To whom must ye make account of the discharge of your Ministry?* *A.* To Jesus Christ. *Q. Whose Ministers are ye?* *A.* The Ministers of Jesus Christ. *Q. Will ye be faithful Ministers to him?* *A.* We purpose and resolve so. *Q. What is your Judgment in Church-Affairs?* *A.* Our Judgment in Church-Affairs is known, that it's the same it was, and that is no secret, but well known. *Object. But your*
known

known judgment in Church-Affairs is opposite to the Government now settled in the Church by the Magistrate, and therefore it can hardly be expected that ye will be Loyal to the King, who hath settled a Government which consists not with your known judgments. *Ans.* Notwithstanding of our known

judgments in the matters of Church-Government, yet we will behave as becometh Loyal Subjects. *Object.* But your Loyal behaviour will onely be from fear, and for your own ease. *Ans.* We look up-

on Lawful Authority as the excellent Ordinance of God, and will be Loyal Subjects from a Lawful Principle of Conscience: These things are clear in Mr. H's Speech. *Q.* Hath the Magistrate a Power

formally Ecclesiastical? *A.* A Power formally Ecclesiastical cannot be allowed to the Magistrate.

Q. Can ye receive Instructions Regulating you in the exercise of your Ministry, or Instructions intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical Regulating you in the exercise of your Ministry, from the Magistrate? *A.* We

cannot receive Instructions intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical Regulating us in the exercise of our Ministry, from the Magistrate. *Q.* Whose Ser-

vants are ye in the matters of your Ministry, whose will and pleasure ye must obey? *A.* In the matters of our Ministry we are the Servants of Christ.

Q. May not the Magistrate lay on burdens upon you in the matters of your Ministry by his Authority? *A.* Such commands are impositions; it's our earnest

desire that the Magistrate may not burden our Ministry with such impositions, for we are the Servants of Christ in these matters; but if he do lay on such impositions, we cannot approve or receive

them, for we are the Servants of Christ in these matters; as these matters are the matters of Christ, and we his Servants in these matters, so we must be at his will in these matters. *Obj. Then ye give the Magistrate no Power in reference to you that's Ministers, and your Ministerial actings; and is not this just the Popish error, who exempts their Clergy-men from Subjection to the Magistrate?* *A.* We willingly grant to the Magistrate all that Power that God and Orthodox Divines gives to him; for though the Magistrate may not make Religious and Ecclesiastical matters which God hath not made, and though he may not exerce any Act which formally and intrinsically is a Ministerial Act; yet he hath a Power conversant about Ecclesiastical matters or objects, which they call a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, by which he may command Ministers and private Persons in his Dominions to do what God hath commanded them to do, and put both Ministers and others to serve God in their stations, he may add his Sanction to Ecclesiastical Canons made by Ecclesiastical Courts, and press the observance of them, under Civil Penalties. *Obj. Yes, yes, any thing that Kirk-men does, he may come after and back it, and is that all?* *A.* We do not say, that the Magistrate must blindly execute what the Ecclesiastical Courts concludes; we acknowledge that he hath the judgment of his Vocation, whereby he may judge whether their Conclusions be for the Spiritual weal and Temporal Peace of his Subjects, and according as he finds cause, either countenance or discountenance them in what they do. If a Synod were so far wrong, as to make an Act
for

for Worshipping Images, as the second *Nicen* Council did, he may discountenance them, and punish the makers or keepers of that Idolatrous Decree: If they make Decrees contrary to Religion and Righteousness, he should discountenance them, and not suffer his Subjects to be abused by such Canons. If any object, that this concession gives the Magistrate Power to overturn all, I answer not at all, for it's onely a Power to preserve the matters of God (which are the object about which his Power is conversant) where they are in purity, or to restore them to their purity and integrity. If ye say, what if the Magistrate err, and be mistaken? I answer, what if Kirk-men be mistaken, and conclude wrong things? Both these are very caseable suppositions that hath followed upon that woful supposition of *Adam's* fall; but the errors that both Magistrates and Ministers are subject to, must not make us deny either of them the Power which God hath given to them, or confound their Offices, which God hath made distinct. The Historian says, *it was general*. *Ans.* It behoved to be so, because it was to comprehend many particulars. Again, Mr. B's. Testimony, which he commends, was general; beside, some of the Brethren made particular exceptions against particular Instructions, against one, as bringing them in subordination to Prelacy, contrary to their Principles, against another as impracticable. If he mean that it had no particular reference, to these Instructions, this will be like the rest of his imaginations. The time, the place, the occasion of these Speeches, the particular pointing at some of the Instructions, the comprehending of

them in the more general designation of impositions, and others of them in that description of them, Instructions formally and intrinsically Ecclesiastical, Regulating the exercise of the Ministry, shews, that these Ministers were not speaking of Instructions in *Utopia*, and my L. Chancellour knew well enough that they were speaking of these Instructions, for he would not have threatned to punish them for not observing Instructions which the Magistrate had never given to them. *Then, he says, it was impertinent, confused, indistinct.* *Ans.* He hath by his confused quibbling endeavoured to make it appear so, but the pertinency and clearness of it is manifest to all who will not shut their eyes, and the impertinency of his confused questions, which have their rise from his own confused fancy, and not from the matter, which gave no occasion for them, is sufficiently discovered. *He says, it's defective.* *Ans.* I refer the Reader to the Answers of the fore-going Questions, which are the words, or the obvious and manifest sense of their words before the Council, and then to the consideration of all the genuine consequences, which necessarily and clearly follows, from these truths asserted in these Answers; and then let him judge, whether their Testimony was defective.

In denying to the Magistrate a Power formally Ecclesiastical, all *Erastianism*, properly so called, is excluded; and in asserting that in the matters of the Ministry, they are Christs Servants, and consequently not the Servants of men, in these matters; and in designing Acts burdening their Ministry, by the name of impositions, they have clearly shewed,
that

that these matters are not at the will and pleasure of men; for if the Magistrate might warrantably command what he pleased in these matters, his commands would not be impositions, but Lawful commands. Now if the Lord would incline the hearts of Rulers to forbear to assume a Power formally Ecclesiastical, that's the Power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and to forbear to burden the Church with impositions, commanding what the Lord hath forbidden, or forbidding what the Lord alloweth; or hindring and marring the Servants of Christ in his Service: I suppose none who were judicious, would complain, though they used their objective Power, in commanding what God hath commanded, and forbidding what he hath forbidden, and pressing these commands, where there is need, with Civil Penalties: And the Servants of Christ would rejoyce to see the Civil Magistrate using the Civil Power, which he hath from God, for the glory of God, in putting the Ministers of Christ to their Duty. He says, *There was in this way of vindicating Truth, much pusillanimity, dissingenuity, carnal consultation, occasioning misconceptions, and blindness.* *Answ.* The Historians blindness in and misconceptions of this matter, hath occasioned and caused this false and uncharitable accusation: All who know these Ministers, knows their candour and ingenuity; and their Brethren, who were with them at their meetings at that time, can witness their integrity; and their words uttered before the Council do evidence. They evidenced much more courage before the Magistrate than the Author did, when brought before the Ma-

gistrate, for any thing I can hear; but ordinarily men who have least courage, are most vehement exacters of it in others, and most ready to upbraid others with pusillanimity; they use to talk much of courage when they are at a good distance from the place where danger is, but when they come where the fray is, they are as afraid as other folk. The Brother who hath answered this History, relates, that a Minister who was brought before the Council in the year 1662. for calling his Neighbour a Knave, because, contrary to his promise, he had gone to the first *Diocesan* Synod, being interrogate, wherefore he called his Neighbouring Minister a Knave? He answered, because he said one thing, and did another. This Answer was much more general and abstract from Prelacy or Supremacy and Covenant-breaking, than the Answers of the Indulged Ministers; the reason why he called him a Knave really, was his conforming to Prelacy, established by the Supremacy, and his Covenant-breaking. But the Brother who is so much for particular, plain, distinct Testimony in others, he contented himself with this confused general. He adds, that another Brother, who in the preceeding year, was brought before the Parliament for asserting the Obligation of the Covenant, in a Sermon; when he compeared, all his Testimony was, a mincing of these expressions made use of in that Sermon. But, saith he, I pitied him, because he was in hazard of his Life. And yet both these Brethren have exclaimed much against the Indulged Ministers, for not giving a plain, open, full Testimony before the Rulers. Several People would have a Testimony,

mony, as the Cat would have fish without wetting their feet; *Catus amat piscem, sed non vult tangere lympham*; or as the Ape would have Chesnuts out of the fire, without burning their own fingers, and therefore makes use of the Cats foot to pull them out. They would have Indulged Ministers giving plain Testimonies to the Magistrates face, but all their own Testimonies are given behind the Magistrates back, and they look rather like Satyrick invectives, and railing accusations, than the Gospel-Testimonies of Gospel-Ministers, who should with meekness Instruct, even those who oppose themselves, if God peradventure will give them Repentance; and who should not do any thing, that really tends to harden or irritate; but do all things that are allowed of God, to mollifie the hearts, even of these who oppose themselves. Their way puts me in mind of the way of some fresh-water Souldiers, who when they are called to fight and shoot, have neither heart nor hand to draw or present their Muskets, let be to give fire, but flees as fast and far as their feet will carry them; and when they are at a great distance, they give brave fire, and shoots abundance of great volleys at the wind; and if upon the Report of these volleys they be enquired after, they disappear, *nusquam apparent*.

The Historian shuts up this matter by desiring the Informer to tell him, *If he think not, that more plain, clear, and full expressions might have been fallen on.* *Ans.* Here he seems to grant that their expressions were plain, clear, and full; for the comparative supposes the positive; and must honest men be condemned of Treachery, because they fell not

upon the plainest words and fullest expressions? Must there be Confusion and Treachery in every Testimony that is not clear in the superlative degree? These Brethren used the expressions, which Divines who writ most deliberately, and distinctly, and soundly in these matters, use; and I am very confident if they had known clearer expressions to have exprest their mind, in that matter, they would have used them.

The Author of this History hath not fallen upon more distinct words, for any thing I^s remember. For the words which he suggests, *pag. 75.* where he says, *Why was it not more distinctly, and in fewer words said, that they could not receive the Instructions, as being intrinsically and formally Ecclesiastical, Regulating them, who were the Servants of Christ in these matters.* For 1. Though this had been distinct, yet it would not have been true; for by his own confession, the confinement was wholly Political. 2. It's confused, at least, I do not distinctly understand what matters these matters are, which are in the end of his distinct words; no doubt, these words mean matters, but what matters he means, I can hardly imagine. If he had spoken before of the matters of the Ministry, as Mr. H. did, it would have been clear; but there is no matters before in his Speech, but the Councils Instructions, and a description of them; now if these matters have not a reference to these Instructions, they have a reference to nothing, that the hearer or reader of them can understand, though the matters he meant might be distinct enough in his own mind, they could not be distinctly taken up

up by his hearers or readers, except he had some way signified his mind : He is now speaking of distinct Testimonies, and Testimonies are not given by meer thinking ; so that the Instructions of the Council must be meant by these matters, or else they will have no sense at all, that we can understand from his words ; and words that have no sense, are not distinct words. If by these matters, he means the Councils Instructions, then the Council might have urged them to obey these Instructions : Thus, seeing ye are the Servants of Christ, in these Instructions, then why will ye not serve Christ, in observing these Instructions, or doing these matters, in which ye are the Servants of Christ ? Why refuse ye to receive these Instructions, or these matters, in which ye are the Servants of Christ ? And does he not here fall in the fault, which he very unreasonably charges Mr. *H.* with ? He alledges, that Mr. *H.* in giving to the Magistrate a Power objectively Ecclesiastical, did give him a Power to make Rules intrinsically Ecclesiastical, for Regulating Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, and to give these very Rules, which he had said, he could not receive from the Magistrate, there was neither Reason, nor shadow of Reason for charging Mr. *H.* with this contradiction ; but the Author of the History hath laid himself very open to this charge. For if these Instructions be matters wherein Ministers are the Servants of Christ, then he hath yielded to the Magistrate a Power to command Ministers to observe them ; for Magistrates may command Ministers to serve Christ in doing these things, in which they are the Servants of Christ. If it be
said,

said, that he meant the matters of their Ministry, and not the Councils Instructions, then his meaning was good, but his words were not distinct at all, and far less more distinct than Mr. H's. It's true, his words are some fewer, that he leaves out some of Mr. H's. words, but they are so much the worse and confused, and by his brevity he falls in obscurity — *brevitas esse laboro, obscurus fio*. These words of his, which he prescribes for a form, as more distinct and short, than Mr. H's. words, are either not good Grammar, having a Relative without any Antecedent in the preceding words, to which they can relate, and so they are without sense, I shall not say non-sense, or they have a bad sense in acknowledging these Instructions to be matters in which Ministers are Christs Servants; and such a fault in Morality was large worse than a Grammatical failing in speaking non-sense: And they involve a contradiction, or they give a Reason why they could not receive these Instructions, which will infer the conclusion that's contradictory to their Assertion. But make the best of them that may be, they are not more distinct than Mr. H's. nay, for any thing that I can see, they are words very confused, and if they relate to all the Instructions, as I shewed, they are manifestly false. By the Historians own confession one of them had no Ecclesiastical Being at all, being wholly Political; and therefore they could not truly say of all of them, that they could not receive them, as being Rules intrinsically, &c. It is strange that the Historian, who is here finding fault with the Indulged Ministers words, as a dis-ingenuous, indistinct, confused

sed *cothurnus*, could not speak more truly and distinctly himself; he who would teach others to speak, should have learned his Grammar better; and he who blames honest men for disingenuity, should not have endeavoured to put a lie in their mouth; and that even in the form of speech, which he prescribes as more distinct, he should be so very confused, is a very strange thing. The more I examine the Historians quibblings against these Brethrens words before the Council, I think the more of these Brethrens words, and am confirmed that the Lord was with their mouth, and gave them what to speak; and I am the more confirmed in this, by observing that this Historian could not mend what they said, without falling into a manifest falshood, and into a form of speech, which either is non-sense, or hath an ill sense, and destroys it self, by giving a Reason in the end of the speech, for refusing the Instructions, which doth prove that they should not be refused, and so the end destroys the beginning of it.

And thus the integrity and faithfulness of these Ministers is cleared; and whether or not all the Cavils and Quibblings of the Historian against their acceptance of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, and against their Speeches before the Council, be not sufficiently, if not superabundantly refuted, I leave it to the impartial judgment of the judicious Reader.

The Brother who hath Answered this History, — hath shewed the falshood of the two Observations which the Historian makes, *pag. 56.* by shewing, *That upon the call of the Congregation of Irwin, that*
Reverend

Reverend Brother (after his Confinement was changed by the Council, upon the supplication of the said Congregation) did remove to Irwin. And that the Act of Council, which came to that Ministers hand, made no mention of the Instructions. So that his seeing that the Act of Council is the All and onely ground of transportation, and that the Instructions always go with the Indulgence, are two other of his false Visions.

And thus I have considered all the Historians Reasons against the acceptance of the Indulgence, and discovered their unreasonableness, and have considered his Answers to these Objections, which he was pleased to propose to himself, and have found his Answers to be indeed no Answers. I have also examined all his quibblings against the Speeches of these of the Indulged Ministers, who appeared before the Council; and have discovered how vain they are, and I refer it to the judgment of the judicious Reader, if I have passed any thing in his Arguings, that had any appearance or shadow of Reason. I am so far from apprehending that the judicious Reader will censure me for omitting any thing which deserved an Answer, that upon the contrary, I fear, I shall be censured by the judicious, for refuting many things which are so manifestly false, that they did not deserve to be noticed. I shall onely desire such to consider, that many things which are manifestly false, may appear true to those who are weak, and who have not their senses exercised to discern both good and evil: And so that which is needless to the strong, may be necessary for those who are weak.

It remains that I examine his Vindication of such as scruple to hear and own the Indulged Ministers, which begins pag. 128. and continues to the end of his Book. He makes some fashion here of stating a Question.

1. He grants, *That the Indulged Ministers are Ministers of the Gospel.* And in his 28 Questions (which were as vant-couriers sent before this History, where the main body of his forces are drawn up) he says, *he chearfully grants them to be Ministers, and nothing doubts, but the people would willingly bear these same Indulged men, if they would relinquish the Indulgence, and go to the fields and Preach with the rest.* He says here, *That he doth not make this the Question, whether or not these Indulged Ministers are true Ministers of the Gospel, or ought in any case to be acknowledged and looked upon as such.*

2. He grants, *Tbat it is not simply unlawful to hear these Indulged.* In his 28 Questions he says, *He durst not say, that it were simply unlawful to hear the Curats.*

3. He grants, *That they may be lawfully heard at some time, and in some Circumstances; as for example, if there were no other to be heard in all Scotland.* In his 28 questions he says, *I should readily grant, that in some cases, and in some circumstances, they might not onely be Lawfully heard, and joyned with, but also should and ought be heard: As for example, if there were no other in all Scotland to be heard but such as were settled by the Councils Orders.* And I would (says he) *yield as much even as to the Curats, I mean such of them as were*
not

not openly flagitious and profane, or are not notoriously ignorant. If there were no other in all Scotland to be heard.

The Reason moving him to make these concessions, is, that they have the essentials of the Ministerial Office, and so their Ministerial Actings are valid; and are not nullities; for so says he, if they are not Ministers, all the Children whom they have Baptized are yet unbaptized; and all their Ministerial Acts are null: And to evite this Absurdity, he will not say, that they are not Ministers. We have heard what he grants, let us hear what he denies. 1. He denies, *That the People among whom the Indulged Ministers are settled, are to own these Ministers as their Ministers, their Pastours or Overseers, set over them by the Holy Ghost.* 2. He denies, *That it's Lawful and expedient to hear them, when there are other Ministers in Scotland to be heard.* Then he affirms, *That it is these Peoples Duty to withdraw from the Indulged to hear and countenance other Ministers, who are not Indulged;* and he insinuates Reasons, why they are to withdraw from the one, and countenance the other.

1. *The Non-indulged Preach upon Christs call, but the Indulged Preach not upon Christs call, but by mans Order. The Indulged Ministers are not over the People in the Lord, are not set over them to be their Pastours and Overseers by the Holy Ghost, but the Non-indulged are over them in the Lord, and set over them as Pastours and Overseers by the Holy Ghost. The Non-indulged Preach contrary to mans Order, or as it is in his 28 questions, they Preach upon the call of Christ, and not upon the Warrant*
and

and Order of the Council, but contrary thereto; but the Indulged Preach not contrary to the Warrant and Order of the Council. There are not such exceptions against the Non-indulged, as there are against the Indulged. The Non-indulged are owned and countenanced of the Lord in a remarkable and wonderful manner. The Indulged are not so countenanced, &c. Though he do not expressly deny all to the Indulged, which he ascribes to the Non-indulged; and though he do not expressly ascribe to the Non-indulged, what he denies to the Indulged; yet, seeing he is making a comparison to shew the difference betwixt the Indulged and not Indulged; and seeing he is in this comparative balancing the Indulged and not Indulged, whatever he puts, as ponderous and advantageous in the one Scale, he must keep it out of the other; and upon the contrary, what is wanting or naught in the one, must be, or be right in the other, or else his comparison would not be fair, and his Weights and Balance false.

Thus we have the state of the Question before us, let us examine how it stands, and if it be consistent with the Historians tenets. 1. He grants the Indulged Ministers to be Ministers of the Gospel; then his own mouth condemns him, for if they be Ministers of the Gospel, they have not renounced their Ministerial mission and their dependance upon Christ: And therefore the Historian grants, that he said false, when he said they had done so. They who renounce that which essentially constitutes the Ministerial Office, they are not Ministers of the Gospel; and they who are Ministers of the Gospel, have not renounced what is essentially constitutive of the Gospel-

Gospel-Ministry. Thus the Historian hath eaten in all these horrid calumnies of this nature, which in his Letters and this History he hath cast upon the Indulged Ministers. 2. If they be Ministers of the Gospel, they ought to Preach the Gospel: But this Historian says, they should not Preach; for he says, none should hear them, but all should withdraw from them; and thus they should Preach the Gospel, because they are Ministers of the Gospel, and they should not Preach, because none should hear them, and Ministers are not obliged to Preach, where there are none to hear, and when none should hear: And thus he makes them Ministers and no Ministers; for a Minister who should Preach, and whom none should hear, is a Minister and no Minister. He grants that the Ministerial Acts, which they have done, are valid, they are not nullities; but if this Historian get his will, they shall be incapacitate to Baptize, &c. any more; and thus he turns them into meer insignificant cyphers. The only comfort in this sad case is, that if they will but come out of the Kirk to the Fields, and so change the place of their Preaching, they shall make as significant figures as the Non-indulged: For he who is but a cypher in the Kirk, will make a great figure in the Fields, though he stand there alone, and no other Minister be with him: This is a new Arithmetical invention, to make a cypher, which signified nothing, by a meer local removal, to become a very significant figure, though no figure be prefixed to it, to add any virtue to it. I wonder whence it comes, that the Fields and Mountains in *Scotland* have such virtue, and have it not

in any other part of the World, that we hear of; — for in *Scotland*, according to this Authors Opinion, a Minister who signifies nothing in a Kirk, where the Magistrate allows him the peaceable exercise of his Ministry, if he will take the Fields, he shall not only be a man, a Minister in the Fields, but cheerfully heard, and countenanced, and owned, not onely of men, but of the Lord in a wonderful manner: And the Blessing which was withheld from the People in the Kirk, justly because of their sin, they shall find it in the Fields, notwithstanding of their provocations. See *pag.* 133. Or if the Author thought that the Fields had this force every where, I wonder how he did not take the Fields in *Holland*, where they say the Magistrate claims more Power, in reference to matters of Religion, than the Historian allows; but on the contrary, he stayed within the Kirk, as long as the Magistrate allowed, & even when the Magistrate would not suffer him to Preach in the Kirk, he never went to the Fields, for any thing we could hear, but kept himself within doors. I see the change of places makes a change in some mens minds, and therefore that doth not hold always: *Cælum non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt*, And that the Fellow who said, *Si tu hic esses, aliter sentiret*, was not altogether senseless.

But again, if the Indulged Ministers be Ministers of the Gospel, and do indeed Preach the Gospel, then the People who received them as their own Ministers, formerly ordained by the Presbytery to take the charge of them; or who in their destitute condition, invited them as Ministers, ordained, to come and Preach the Gospel to them, are obliged

to own them as Ministers of the Gospel, and to countenance them in Preaching, and if they withdraw from them, and break off that Communion in the publick pure Worship of God in which they formerly joyned, they are guilty not only of ingratitude, in deserting the Ministers of the Gospel, who come upon their invitation, to help them in their destitute condition, but they are guilty of Separation or Schism.

2. He grants, *That it is not simply sinful to hear the Indulged Ministers.* Then he said false, when he said, *These Ministers were not Christs Ambassadors, for to hear these, as Ministers, as Christs Ambassadors, who are not sent by him, but sent by men Usurping Christs Authority, were simply sinful, if they have renounced their dependance on Christ, &c.* 2. And he speaks a gross untruth, when he says, *That the hearing of Indulged Ministers is an homologating, countenancing, approving of a sinful Supremacy, and that the hearing of Curats is an approving of Prelacy; for the approving of that which is sinful, and in its own nature sinful, is simply sinful; the approving of that which is in it self ill, and always and at all times evil, that is, not only now and then, but always, and in all cases sinful, and simply sinful.* 3. He grants, *That if there were no other Ministers in Scotland, that none would scruple to hear the Prelates Curates:* And in his 28 questions, *That in that case not only might the Indulged and the Curats be heard, but they should and ought to be heard.* Then he must quit that conceit, that the hearing of Indulged Ministers, and of Curats, is an approbation of sinful Supremacy and Prelacy;
for

for men should never approve that which is in its self evil. 2. He miserably torments the Consciences of the poor simple People, who will believe him; for he tells them, it's unlawful to hear Indulged Ministers while there are others in *Scotland* to be heard; but if there be no others, then it's not only Lawful, but a Duty to hear the Indulged Ministers: So that the People, in Order to the resolution of this case of Conscience, whether they do right or wrong in hearing or not hearing the Indulged Ministers, they must inform themselves, whether there be any other Minister alive in *Scotland*; and so long as they hear there is any one alive, though he were living in the *Mull of Galloway*, and they were living at *John a Grotts*, it were sinful for them to hear Indulged Ministers; but if he were dead, it were a sin not to hear: And so the People would be in Conscience obliged to keep up a constant Intelligence, that they might know how soon that Minister died, that they might not neglect their Duty in hearing Indulged Ministers. His advice to hear the Curats or Indulged Ministers, in case there were no other to hear, comes too late to the People whom he commends for their leading of Ministers, and breaking the ice, for they are far before him here; for they will choose rather to hear none at all, than to hear either Bishops Curats, or Council-Curats; and some of them say, they like the last worse than the first: And if the Historian were living, there are some of these People who would not hear himself, if they knew he were of that Opinion, that either Indulged Ministers or Curats should be heard in any case. Some of them

would tell him, that he is all mistaken, when he thinks that the Baptism administred by Curats is valid, and is not a nullity; for they judge it to be much worse than a nullity, to be even the mark of the Beast. And seeing he acknowledges the People for Guides, he must follow them, they will not come back to him; if he cry after them, that he meant not flagitious and ignorant Curats, but those who are knowing and of sober conversations, they will cry back, we who are common People, are not for distinctions, as ye your self said: We will hear none of them in no case; whole Sale is good Sale: And therefore follow us, who have guided you, who are Ministers, now a long time, and ye your self have commended us for good Guides, and if ye will not follow us, we and you will shed, for ye are slipped aside, we are where we were, ye are fallen off, and so we are not to be blamed for the breach. And if the Historian have no other Reason for hearing the Indulged, or the Conformists, when folk can do no other ways but that which he mentions, *viz.* the shunning of that absurdity, that if they were no Ministers, their Baptisms, &c. would be nullities, and the Children were unbaptized: If this be all, it may be made use of to persuade the People in a mister to hear a Popish Priest, for the Baptism that he administers is not a nullity, and Papists when they turn Protestants, are not re-baptized; and where away this will lead, let any who have any discerning in these matters, judge.

The Reasons for which he would have the People with-drawing, are, 1. *That they are not called by Christ, nor set over the People by the Holy Ghost,*
but

but by the Council. If it be reduced to form, and candidly proposed, it must run thus: The Council permitted and allowed the Indulged Ministers the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, in such and such Congregations, and therefore they were not called by Christ, nor set over these Congregations by the Holy Ghost: The consequence is manifestly false, for if the Magistrates Civil allowance of the publick peaceable exercise of the Ministry, do make void the potestative mission, which Ministers have from Christ, in their Ordination; and if it destroys the Peoples invitation, and the advice and consent of Ministers concerned, all which the Indulged Ministers had, as hath been shewed before; then it will follow, that where ever the Magistrate permits, allows, appoints Ministers to Preach, that there there are no Ministers called by Christ, or set over People by the Holy Ghost; and of what pernicious consequence this is, and how destructive to the Ministry of the Gospel in all places of the World, where the Magistrate allows of it, any may see with half an eye. Again, may not the People of these Congregations reason thus, if these Ministers, who either were Ordained our Ministers by the Presbytery, or those whom we in our destitute condition did invite to come and help us, and who came with the advice and consent of the generality of the Ministers, which was all could be expected in such a broken time for setting them among us, and applying their Ministry to us for a time: If these be not our Ministers, then certainly there are none whom we can call our Ministers. Is not this the way to shake these People loose of all relation to any

Ministers, as their Ministers, or as sent by Christ to them. If the Historian will not deny that the Ministers not Indulged are called of Christ to Preach to the People who are not of the Congregations where they were formerly Ministers, why should he deny this to the Indulged Ministers, who have much more to make up a Relation betwixt them and these People, than they have to make up a Relation betwixt them and other Ministers, whom it may be they never heard nor saw before, and are not sure whether they be Ministers or not? Such wild fancies as this Author and others have suggested to the People, have brought some to that, that they have respect to no Ministers, and others care for none, except one or two, of whom others who are more discerning, are much ashamed.

As for that Reason, that Indulged Ministers Preach according to mans Order, and the not Indulged Preach not upon the Warrant and Order of the Council, but contrary thereunto. If it be truly proposed, it must run thus: The Indulged have a Civil Order or Warrant for the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, and so their Preaching in these Parishes to which they are Indulged, is not contrary to the Magistrates will, seeing the Magistrate allows them to Preach in these places, and therefore People are to withdraw from hearing them, that they may countenance these Ministers, who have no such Civil Warrant for the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, but Preaches contrary to the Magistrates will. Now what Reason is in this, that the Indulged Ministers should be discountenanced and deserted, because the Magistrate allows them the peaceable

able exercise of their Ministry, and that these Ministers should onely be heard, who Preach contrary to the Magistrates will: The Indulged were as far from receiving their Ministry or Instructions to Regulate them in the exercise of their Ministry, as the not Indulged were. This was the difference, that the Magistrate did countenance or allow the Preaching of the Indulged, and discountenance and disallow the Preaching of the Non-indulged; and should the Indulged be discountenanced, because the Magistrate did permit and allow their Preaching? This bewrays a great disrespect to the Magistrate: Why would not the Author try this in *Holland*, and with some of his Profelytes have taken the Fields, and called away the People from the Ministers, who were countenanced by the Magistrate, to hear them who Preached without and contrary to the Magistrates Order. The People might have countenanced the Non-indulged, and yet not deserted the Indulged; for there were many other places besides Indulged Parishes, who desired the help of outed Ministers, and the countenance of the People, who deserted Indulged Ministers, did not continue towards the Non-indulged, who would not humour them in all things, and hold up their yeas and nays; and as soon as any of these outed Ministers began to signifie their inclination to have the peaceable exercise of their Ministry under the Protection of Lawful Authority, these People who measured Ministers faithfulness by their Preaching contrary to the Magistrates will, did cast at them as Apostates. This I suppose is a new Test for trying what Ministers are called of Christ, which

hath not been before this heard in the Reformed Churches, viz. They whom the Magistrate allows to Preach, they are not called of Christ, and are to be withdrawn from; they who Preach contrary to the Magistrates will, they are called of Christ, and to be countenanced: But it is a detestable test, for it would cast all the Ministers of the Gospel through the World, who have the countenance and protection of Lawful Authority. But though this Test had neither Foundation in Scripture, nor Reason, being contrary to both; yet it was pretty well calculate for the new Common-wealth, which was to be raised upon the Ruines of the present Magistrates. As for that Reason, that there are not such exceptions against the Non-indulged as against the Indulged: I have shewed before, that the exceptions against the Indulged are calumnies, and if Ministers shall be cast and deserted upon calumnies, it's an easie thing to depose them all. It hath been observed, that the best Ministers have been most calumniate, and they whom the Lord put in greatest capacity to do him Service, the Devil and his Instruments did cast most filthy calumnies at such; how many calumnies were cast upon our Lord Jesus, the chief Shepherd, when he was Minister of the Circumcision: Many exceptions were made against *Paul*, the chosen vessel of Christ. *Athanasius* was horribly calumniate by the *Arrians*. As for what he says of the wonderful success of the Non-indulged, and rich Blessing attending their Ministry, it hath been observed by many who were not Indulged, that the Lord blessed the Ministry of these not Indulged Ministers, who made it their busi-

business to Preach the Gospel, and to teach the things which made for Peace and Edification; but as for those few, who made it their business to divide the People, and draw them away from the Indulged Ministers, that they left the People worse than they found them: For the People who listened to them, became more careless of learning the grounds of Religion, and had little heart to any thing but these jangling Debates, which did not tend to Edification, but Division and Confusion; and that they become more vain, and self-conceited, and censorious, and some of them become great and manifest lyars, and calumniators, and of a bitter invective disposition. And if tryal be made in these Parishes, where the Indulged Ministers are, it will be found, that these deserters of the Ministry of the Indulged Ministers, are far inferiour in knowledge, love, diligence to others who have constantly countenanced the Ministry of Indulged Ministers. But this Reason of deserting the Indulged Ministers, is also of most dangerous consequence, and would break the best constituted Church of the World, if it were reduced to practice, and therefore the general Assembly of the Church of *Scotland* made an Act against such as withdraw themselves from the publick Worship in their own Congregations; and this Act was made, as appears in the Act it self, for preserving Order, Unity, and Peace in the Kirk, for maintaining that Respect which is due to the Ordinances and Ministers of Jesus Christ, for preventing Schism, noisom Errors, and all unlawful Practises, which may follow on the Peoples withdrawing themselves from
their

their own Congregations. And any may see, that if People ought to go to these Ministers, who are most eminent for gifts, grace, utterance, success; then all the Congregations of Ministers, who are less eminent for gifts and graces, and have less success in their Ministry, would be quite dissolved. And oft-times weak Ministers have more success in their Ministry, than those who are every way more eminent, as to gifts and graces: Is not the great Pastor of all Pastors brought in by the Prophet, regretting he had laboured in vain? Had ever Christ in the days of his flesh such success as *Peter* had in one Sermon? *Acts 2.* Mr. *Rutherford*, in his *Due right of Presbytery*, shews, that even the Independents would not allow of a Separation from a Congregation where all the Ordinances of Christ are, though the Ministers were less Powerful and Spiritual, to another Congregation, where incomparably there is a more Powerful and more Spiritual Ministry, *pag. 74.* the Independents alledged, that it was the want of something which Christ commanded, which caused them separate. To which Mr. *Rutherford*, after several other things, answers, *pag. 72.* That it is not Christs command, *Mat. 23. 10.* to separate from these Churches, and to renounce all communion with them, because these, who sat in *Moses* Chair did neglect many Ordinances of Christ; for when they gave the false meaning of the Law, they stole away the Law, and so a principal Ordinance of God: and yet Christ I believe forbid Separation, when he commanded that they should hear them, *Mat. 23.* But the Independents were not so in love with Separation, as

to allow Separation from a Church, where all the Lords Ordinances might be enjoyed in Purity, though not in so Powerful a manner as in another Congregation. The Historian dare not deny the Indulged to be Ministers of the Gospel, he dare not say, that the Ordinances are not dispensed by them in Purity, according to Christs Institution; he dare not say, that there are any of Christs Ordinances wanting in the Kirks, which are to be had in the Fields; he dare not say, that any thing sinful is required, as a condition of Church-fellowship in the Congregations where Indulged Ministers Preach; he dare not say, that these Indulged Ministers did intrude themselves upon these Congregations against the will of the People, for they were invited to come, and the People evidenced their consent to their coming, by a chearful attendance upon the Ordinances dispensed by these Ministers: and yet he concludes, that it's unlawful for the People to hear them, and that it's their Duty to break off from that Church-communion and fellowship, in which they did formerly joyn with them; for he presses withdrawing: And he makes this withdrawing from the Indulged Ministers, which is so easie to every profane Person, as he is profane, to be the Duty of a necessary Testimony against sinful Usurpations; and so these profane Persons, who profanely withdraws from the Lords Ordinances, in which they never had any delight, and are glad of any pretext for absenting themselves, are put in conceit that their profanity makes them Martyrs, or Witnesses to the Truth, and against sinful Usurpations. Any may see from his stating of
the

the Question, that he hath been miserably confounded and perplexed. In one of his Letters he says, *There is sin wrapt up in hearing the Indulged*, which would seem to make the hearing of them intrinsically, and so simply sinful; here he makes it onely unlawful, by reason of some Circumstances, and that which he gives as a Circumstance, is one of the oddest Circumstances that ye have readily heard of; it stands so far off, and at so great a distance from hearing, that it's a wonder how it should have any influence to change it in its Morality. He says, it's unlawful to hear the Indulged while there are any other Ministers in all *Scotland* to hear; but when there are no other, then it's not onely Lawful, but it's Duty to hear; that then not onely they may be heard, but they should be heard: It's strange, that the Life of a Minister living, it may be 40, 50 miles from People, who live in places where Indulged Ministers are, should make their hearing of these Indulged Ministers unlawful, and then his death should make it Duty. Seeing he was of Opinion, that such remote Circumstances, which come not near by many miles, make this change in hearing; it was a very ill wailed expression which he used in his Letter, viz. *That sin was wrapt up in hearing the Indulged*: It had been more consonant to this unlawfulness, which arises from Circumstances which are so remote, that they cannot be so much as called adjacent, they lie so far off, and keep at such a distance from the Person who is concerned to know whether his hearing be sin or Duty, that though he keep up a most exact Intelligence, it will be two or three days ere he can hear of the

Cir-

Circumstance that alters the nature of his hearing the Indulged Ministers. I say, it had been more consonant to such a circumstantial unlawfulness, to have said, that sin was wrapped about it, or rather that it was wrapped up at a great distance from it, than that sin was wrapped up in it: For seeing he had a mind that this unlawfulness should be taken off by the change of some very extrinsecal things, he did foolishly to put this unlawfulness within, for it is not so easie to pick out what is within, as to slip off that which is without. I heard from a grave and judicious Minister, who had occasion to meet with one of the young men, who Preached confidently what this Historian wrote, that that Youth kept to this expression, *That sin was wrapt up in hearing Indulged Ministers*, as if it had been his Text; and the poor People drunk in this Schismatick poison, and it hath taken with their affection, that in all appearance, though the Historian were alive, and would write a hundred Letters, and print twenty Books, and declare in them, that there is no sin wrapt up in hearing Indulged Ministers, these People would not believe him, but would adhere to his first Letter: It's an easie thing to drop in the poison of Error and Schism in simple Peoples heads, and hearts, but it's not so easie to purge it out again: It's easie to beget prejudices against Gods Ordinances, and draw People from the Kirk, but it's not so easie to remove these prejudices, and bring them again to the Ordinances. The Heart is naturally corrupt, and corrupt Doctrines are kindly to it, and it takes well with them, and they with it: And Error is like a fretting gangreen,

green, the longer it continues, it rots and spreads the more. And it's observed, that when People drinks in erroneous Doctrines, upon the bare word of these, who teach Division, and their heart and affection takes with Error, though they have neither shadow of Scripture or Reason for it, that they are hardly recovered from these delusions; for People who are misled by some wrested Scripture, or captious Reasoning, they may be more easily recovered, by shewing the true meaning of the wrested and mis-applied Scripture, and the captiousness of the false Reasoning. But when People will err, and love to wander, and will stumble, though they wot not at what, and are so affectionately addicted to their erroneous Opinions, that they will hear nothing that makes against them, there is little probability of Cure; for as they received them without Reason, because they would receive them, so they retain them against Reason, and cannot endure to have these beloved tenets brought under examination and tryal, and therefore they readily flee out in Passion, upon any who would inform them; as mens Lusts are their Idols, so are their Errors, when they are once settled in their hearts. *Augustine* said, that his error was his God; *Error meus erat Deus meus.*

Now if this Historian, who was a man of letters, be so confounded and confused in stating this Question; and is involved in gross contradictions, what wonder, if the poor people, who are not fit for Debates, be whirled round by such whirl-winds, and contrary winds, into a confused giddiness, that they wot not what they say, or affirm, and know not what

what to do; and be like Children, that have so long run about, that they fall down, as unable to stand or move any more: So they are so confounded with these perplexed Questions about hearing; which cannot be propounded, and far less resolved, without manifest Absurdities and Contradictions; that many of them are fallen over in a careless laziness and indifferency about all hearing of the Word, and spends the Lords day in sleeping, loitering, and idle wandering.

The Historian doth but waste time and paper, when he says, that in our best times, People were not so tyed to the hearing of their Ministers, as that they might never, or in no case hear others; for that is not the Question: But this is the true state of the Question, *Whether People who have these Ministers to hear, who were formerly Ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, to be their Pastors, and those who have these Ministers to hear, whom they invited to come and help them, when they were destitute, and had none to Preach to them? If these People who have consented to receive the Lords Ordinances from these Ministers, and have waited on their Ministry, and joyned with them in the Lords Worship, if they ought to break off that Church-fellowship, and though they acknowledge these Ministers to be Ministers of the Gospel, and though these Ministers Preach the Gospel, and dispense the Lords Ordinances, according to the Lords Institution, yet if they ought to withdraw constantly from hearing them, and that because it's unlawful to hear them, and there is sin wrapt up in hearing them, and that they are called of God to withdraw, that*
in

in doing so, they may bear witness against the sinful Usurpations manifest in the Indulgence, and the many evils in accepting it; or more shortly, If it be sin for these People to hear these Ministers, and if it be their Duty to desert them, and separate themselves from these Congregations where they exercise their Ministry. This Historian seemeth to be for the Affirmative, and so confident that these People do right in withdrawing, that he says, *One might think it strange, that there should be any necessity to vindicate them, considering what he hath said above.* I am one of these, who have considered what he hath said above, and I thought it very strange how he could vent such gross and manifestly false Calumnies against faithful Ministers, and how he could wrest and pervert their true, right, honest words, contrary to common sense and equity; that he might wring out of them that which never entred in the thoughts or heart of these Ministers. And again, I think it strange, that by these false and groundless Calumnies which he hath cast upon these honest Ministers, he should labour to rent the Church of God by Schism, by breaking these who will listen to him, off from communicating with the true Church in the true Worship of God, and by pressing them to disown and desert these Ministers, whom they formerly owned and countenanced, and whom they are still obliged to own, and have no just cause to desert, except his false Calumnies be accounted just causes.

Having observed the confusion and contradictions in which the Historian hath involved himself in stating the Question, it remains to consider, what he

he says for the vindication of these who scruple to hear and own the Indulged Ministers. But seeing he says nothing but what he hath said before, and is formerly refuted, I hope the Reader will not expect that I should play the goke, in repeating again his Cuckows, and refuting them, although I followed him before in his extravagant wandrings; when he without, and contrary to all sense and reason, imagined that this or that, or the other thing was the meaning of the Indulged Ministers words; yet I cannot have any pretext for making meer repetitions in his wandrings, there was variety of vain imaginations, which made the refutation of them less tedious, but to repeat the same things to no purpose but to waste time and paper, would be intolerably tedious and nauseating. I shall onely by answering his first Question, shew the way of answering the rest. 1. *Seeing by what is said under our first head of Arguments, &c. Answ.* Seeing by what is said, in answer to your first head of Arguments, it is manifest that the Indulged, in and by their accepting of the Indulgence, have not wronged our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the onely Head of the Church, and King in *Zion*, in any of these nine several particulars (which are nine several Calumnies, the ordinary Arguments which he makes use of against the Indulged Ministers, for he could find no true Arguments to his purpose against them.) How can they but be blamed, who out of a sinful credulity, make up or take up such vile Reproaches against faithful Ministers, and then out of these Calumnies create to themselves scruples, which scare them from hearing these whom the Lord hath sent

to Preach the Gospel to them. And so through the rest of his Questions, where he refers to his heads of Arguments, I refer to the Answers, which cuts off both heads and tails of these captions.

As for the Arguments taken out of the late Apology, which, contrary to the intention of the Apologist, he abuses (for he perverts the words both of the dead and living) they make nothing against the hearing of the Indulged Ministers; (let the Conformists say for themselves) for the applications which the Historian makes to the Indulged, are manifestly false, as hath been already manifested in Answering the Historians Captions and Cavils.

It cannot be denied, that some who have taken upon them to discuss that question about hearing Conformists, have used Arguments, and laid down Grounds, which are new conceits, and contrary to the Principles of the old Non-conformists, and tend directly to Schism. I shall onely relate some of the words of a Godly Learned Minister, who in Answering the 28 Questions, which this Historian sent over before his History, hath spoken somewhat with great Modesty, to this purpose. In Answering the Historians 8th. Question, after he hath shewed how great difference there is betwixt the Indulged Ministers and the Conformists, he says, *But there is one thing I would gladly enquire of him: In his Parenthesis he seems to hint, that the hearing of these Ministers who have complied in their own charges, where they were orderly fixed by the Church of Scotland, is a complying with Prelacy: For my own part, I see not how he will instruct this; and if the sinfulness of hearing them, upon the account of compliance,*

plyance, which is their own personal guilt, be maintained. I see not how that Doctrine can be justified from owning the Principles of Separation, but I shall be glad to learn of him: I confess my judgment hitherto hath been, that it is the Duty of the People to seek their Edification by Presbyterian Ministers, whether in Houses, Fields, or Kirks; and that it is their Duty to discountenance Curates of all kinds: And for intruders, I am not clear for hearing of them, except transiently; for it's very hard to say, that it's sinful in it self to hear them at any time. But for them who comply in their own charges, and Preach Orthodox Doctrine, without corrupting the Ordinances, so as there be no corruptions that are made the conditions of Peoples Communion, I see not how in that case it can be made out, that it is sinful for People to hear them when they can get no better to hear, which the Author himself grants, in stating the Question, and therefore is the more concerned to see to it. It will be necessary we reconcile our practices with our old Principles, for if we drink in new Principles, and once remove March stones, it's hard to know where we may hold; and we had need to be jealous of that new Light which drives us from our old Principles.

In Answering his 26th. Question, he says, This is new Doctrine, that hearing of Ministers will involve the People in the approbation of their sinful entry: It is easie to assert such things, but he will put his Reason upon the Rack before he prove this. 3. When he speaks of the Curates, why does he confound countenancing and hearing, as he doth several times in this Paper? May not Ministers in dispensing of

Ordinances without the mixtures of mens inventions, if they be true Ministers, be heard in many cases, without countenancing their entry and their course? I do wish from my heart, that the People in this Question about hearing had been more distinctly informed, so as they might guard against Rocks on both sides, for I fear the neglect of this shall be the occasion of drinking in of Principles against, or contrary to the former Principles of the Church of Scotland.

And in the close of that Answer, he intreats the Author of these 28 Questions, to ponder how the Doctrine which he delivers, agrees with the Doctrine of our Divines, against Separation. It is the common assertion of our Divines against Separatists, that where the corruptions of a Church are not made the condition of our Communion, it is not Lawful to Separate: And Mr. *Rutherford*, in his *Peaceable Plea*, Chap. 10. makes this the Question, *Whether or not it be Lawful to Separate from a true Church visible, for the corruption of Teachers, and the wickedness of Pastors and Professors, where faith is begotten by the Preaching of the professed Truth.* And through that Chapter he asserts and clears the Negative of that Question. Also (says he) Mr. *Broune*, in his Book against *Volsogen*, pleads against Separation, because of the corruption of Ministers, where Christs Ordinances are pure, and the Essence of the Ministry is not destroyed by their corruptions. And so, though the Indulgence had been sinfully accepted, which yet we deny, it would not destroy the Essence of their Ministry, for the Historian grants they are
true

true Ministers, and he does not charge them with corrupting the Ordinances, and therefore the Historian is condemned by Mr. *Rutherford* and Mr. *Broune*. The Non-conformists might have kept up all due respect to Presbyterian Ministers, and constantly adhered to them and their Ministry, though that new Doctrine of the sinfulness of hearing Conformists had never been taught to them; but some folk cannot do, except they over-do; and in running from one extream rush upon another. I know some alledge, that they see further in these matters than the old Non-conformists did, and they think that the old Non-conformists in writing against Separatists, have wronged the Cause. But it is not want of Ignorance that aileth such People, we are far behind these Godly and Learned men, both in Heavenly Wisdom, and true tenderness, and Zeal; and that which many take for Light and Zeal is Ignorance, Error, Humour, and the wrath of man which perfects not the Righteousness of God. Any who have read what is said before, will see that these Arguments of the Apologist does conclude nothing against hearing the Indulged Ministers, for the applications are manifestly false. I never heard of any Indulged Minister, who entred into the Congregation of a living outed Minister, save one, who had the consent of that Minister, who was out of the Countrey, and had no access to his People. As for what the Author says in the application of the Apologists 7th. Argument, that the hearing of Indulged Ministers is enjoined and required by Law, as a sign of compliance with, and subjecting to *Erastianism*, and the Supremacy,

is so manifest an untruth, that I wonder how his Conscience could suffer his hand to write it: And yet I have found so many falshoods of this kind before, that I need not wonder; and it were unreasonable to expect any other Arguments against Truth and Innocency, and for Schism, but such as are patched up of lies and calumnies. After all his Questions, I may propose one Question, *Why in his Paper sent over before this History, and in this History, he doth not Argue positively, that it's unlawful to hear the Indulged Ministers, but onely moves Questions, if they should be condemned, who do not own and hear the Indulged, as they did formerly:* And after he hath done with his mis-application of the Apologists Arguments, where he seems more positive, yet he ends all with a Question, which he refers to the judgment of the Reader, pag. 159. I apprehend the Historian durst not for his Conscience conclude, that it was sinful to hear, or that it was a Duty to withdraw from hearing the Indulged Ministers; he knew, and his Conscience put him to declare, that the acceptance of the Indulgence and the Councils Order, as he calls it, settling the Indulged Ministers, did not make it sinful to hear these Ministers, for he confesses, that notwithstanding of the settling of these Ministers by the Councils Order, yet, if there were no other to be heard, they not onely might be Lawfully heard and joyned with, but they should and ought to be heard. See the stating of the Question in his 28 Questions. But though he durst not positively conclude the sinfulness of hearing the Indulged Ministers, yet the poor People thinks that he hath done it; and they are run

so far from hearing the Indulged Ministers, that they are without his cry to bring them back, though there were no other to hear : And too many by these questions about hearing, are become careless of all hearing, and some place their Religion in no hearing. It had been good for many they had never intermeddled with these questions about hearing, for they are by the wind of Erroneous and Schismatical Doctrines, driven from the Publick Worship of God : And they take the profanation of the Sabbath in despising the Publick Ordinances to be a piece of tenderness and Religion ; and if the Lord prevent it not, they are like to turn Quakers, Pagans, Atheists, and to shake off the very form of Religion, both in publick, private, and secret. The Lord in mercy pity and prevent the ruine that the poor People are blindly running upon.

Page 159. He proposes Objections to be answered.

The first Objection should have been proposed thus. *Ministers of the Gospel, who are Ordained and admitted Ministers of their respective Congregations, and Ministers who not having access to these Congregations, where they were Ordained Ministers, are invited by desolate vacant Congregations to Preach the Gospel to them, and who, upon their invitation and consent of the Ministers concerned, come to help these destitute, desolate Congregations, should not be disowned, discountenanced, deserted, while they are doing the Work of the Ministry, to which God hath called them by these People, who invited them to Preach the Gospel to them : But the Indulged Ministers were either Ordained, &c. or*
invited,

invited, and come with consent of the Ministers concerned, &c. And therefore they should not be deserted while they are doing the Work of the Lord, to which these respective Congregations invited them. If he had thus proposed the Argument, he could not have evaded the force of it, but it is his way to make Objections so, as he may leave some way for himself to escape. The true state of the Question is, *Whether these respective Congregations should disown and reject these Ministers of the Gospel, whom they had invited, and with consent of the Ministers concerned, had received and appropriate to themselves, to whom they had submitted, and whom they had countenanced in the exercise of their Ministry.* Now, why should they reject them, as if they had nothing to do with them, whom they received? Why should they disown them, whom they owned, and whom they desired to own them? Why should they withdraw from hearing these, whom they invited to Preach to them? Should they leave them, because they Preach the Gospel to them? While this Author calls in question, if the Indulged Ministers be Lawfully called, and appropriate Pastours of this Church, he calls in question, if this Church have any Pastours; for they were Ordained by laying on of the hands of the Presbytery according to the Order of the Gospel; and if this make them not Pastours of this Church, I would know who are Pastours of it.

As for his second Objection, taken from Mr. Livingston's Advice to hear Mr. John Scot, an Indulged Minister, he had better forbore to mention it, than to have past it with such Answers as he gives.
Mr.

Mr. *Livingston*, whom he acknowledges an eminent Seer and Servant of Christ, advised to hear the Indulged. This Historian advises to withdraw from hearing the Indulged: And it's no disparagement to the Historian, to say, that Mr. *Livingston's* Advice was preferable to this Historians Advice, who for Learning, Piety, Prudence, Experience, and Age, was far inferiour to Mr. *Livingston*: The onely thing which Mr. *Livingston* missed, so far as I remember, was a Testimony; and if he had been well informed of the Testimonies which the Indulged Brethren gave, upon several occasions, and particularly before the Council, and of the consonancy of their Practice to their verbal Testimony, and their former Principles, he would have been much confirmed in advising to hear Indulged Ministers. The Historian says, that he does not certainly know whether this Advice of Mr. *Livingston* proceeded from want of full information of Circumstances, or from Ignorance of the Magistrates design, or from fear, that Field-meetings would cease; but he inclines to the last, because Mr. *Livingston* speaks not of his Peoples going to the Field-meetings.

Ans^w. We have seen that any Light which this Historian hath gotten from Circumstances, is darkness. And I am very confident, if Mr. *Livingston* had lived to see what Erroneous and Schismatick inferences this Historian hath made from the information which he hath gotten of many Circumstances, and had seen the horrid Divisions and Confusions following upon these Erroneous dividing Doctrines, he would either have judged, that that
Cir-

Circumstantial Light was darknes, or if it was light, that this Historian did draw darknes out of light. But I know no Circumstance of any importance which could make any thing against the Indulgence, which was unknown to Mr. *Livingston*. Mr. *Livingston* was a wiser man, than to take his measures of judging of the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of hearing Indulged Ministers, from the Magistrates designs and intendments: Though Ministers and People were clear, that the Magistrate had an ill design, in permitting or allowing Ministers to Preach the Gospel, and People to hear; or in permitting Masters of Families to pray in their Families, or in permitting Physicians to cure Diseased People; yet no rational man, who is not blinded with Humour or some prejudice, will conclude from the Magistrates ill design, which is his Act, and no way approved, but disapproved by these Ministers, Masters of Families, Physicians; that it is unlawful for them to Preach, Pray, or Cure Diseased Persons. Mr. *Livingston*'s fears that Field-meetings would cease, it seems have been better founded than the Historians confidence, that they would continue. And though it cannot be supposed that Mr. *Livingston* was an Enemy to Field-meetings, yet none who knew him, will think that he was so fond of the Fields, that he would have preferred the Fields to a Kirk, if the Kirk could have contained all who were to hear him. And seeing he speaks nothing of Field-meetings, it seems he had not learned that new Doctrine of the Historian, that fasting Feasts and the wonderful continuance and Blessing of God, was onely to be found

in Fieldings; and that People from whom God justly with-holds the Blessing in the Kirk, because of sin, may find it in the Fields, notwithstanding of their provocations; for if he had been of that Opinion, he would not have failed to exhort his People to go to the Fields. And although he had heard, that the Lord did countenance the Preaching of the Gospel in the Fields, he would not have Advised his People to run at random, to hear any body who Preached in the Fields. No, no, Mr. *Livingston* was more Advised, and sicker in his Advice, *sicker* than so, for wise men, like Mr. *Livingston*, use to fore-see evils, and prevent them, while the simple pass on, and are punished. For Mr. *Livingston* could not but fear, that if his People did run to hear any who Preached in the Fields, though they knew not who the Preacher was, and whence he came, that they might readily find instead of Ministers a cheating Cobler, or a Tanner; instead of a solid, judicious Minister, some ignorant rash young man, who instead of the sincere Milk of the Word, would give the People the windy froth of his own Conceits; and instead of the wholesome words of Christ, would give them his own ill Humours and Reproaches of honest Ministers, and his own doltings about Questions and doubtful Disputations, which would divert the People from the main thing, and fill their Heads with confounding notions, and their Mouths with vain janglings, and so alienate their minds and hearts from these things which make for Peace and Edification. Or that they might, perhaps, find instead of a Protestant Presbyterian Minister, a Popish Priest or Frier; and so
instead

instead of Food find Poyson, and instead of a Blessing, find a Curse. Mr. *Livingston* knew the tricks of Jesuits better than the Historian, and therefore would have rather Advised them still to hear Mr. *John Scot*, who he knew was a Godly Orthodox Minister, than have exposed his People to run such risks; he knew the saying, *Qui amat pericula, peribit in illis*, He who loveth hazards, shall perish in them.

To the third Objection, *That the People heard the Indulged Ministers, and were Edified by their Ministry, till some inconsiderate Persons took it in their Head, to cry out against the unlawfulness of bearing the Indulged, as if that had been the only thing necessary, for which many even of the Non-indulged are offended with them.*

The Historian Answers, *That the Curats might alledge that as well as the Indulged.*

Ans. He is a little out of that story, as well as in many other: Any who knows the truth, knows how great a disparity there was in the cases; so that his, *as well*, had been as well, and better out than in, for it makes his Allegiance false. He says, *he is not fit to judge if these Persons be inconsiderate, but he wishes that they who call them so, would remember that, Judge not, lest ye be judged, &c.*

Ans. He was very unfit by Reason of his distance and mis-information of many other things, which yet he hath very peremptorily judged. I wish he had sooner considered his unfitness to judge of others, and had, ere he began to write this History, remembered that, *Judge not, lest ye be judged*; it might have prevented his writing this Book, which

which is mainly founded upon rash and false judgements, and reproaches. The inconsiderateness of these Persons he speaks of, was so evident, and so sensibly felt in the effects of it, that they who had any consideration or common sense, could not but see it: And the second thoughts, and third thoughts of these who were displeased with their way, makes no change upon these Brethren, but confirms them the more. He found not himself fit to judge whether they were inconsiderate or not, yet he finds himself fit to judge them worthy of praise: But if he was not in a capacity to judge them considerate, he could be in no good capacity to judge them worthy of praise: For if they were inconsiderate Persons, they were not to be praised; and till he had evidence that they were considerate, he might have spared his praises, and his Blessing of God in their behalf, till he had been better informed.

As for his hopes that the fruits of their labour proclaim their insisting upon the one thing necessary. I see not what ground he had for this hope, for the ordinary fruits of their labour, was the kindling of the fire of Contention, Strife, Debate, Confusion, Reproaches of these who followed not with them: But for the fruits of the Spirit, Love, Joy, Peace, Long-suffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, Temperance, I wish we could see them in these, who with him did so much cry up these Preachers. He tells us, that at the beginning of the Indulgence, People called them the Councils Curats; and he will not enquire how it came, that that spark did not break forth into a general flame; and insinuates his desire, that this flame had spread sooner,

sooner, and that the first ten had been discountenanced ; but he acquiesces in Providence.

But if he had known what I learned from a Gentleman, who hath good Intelligence, that it was the late Arch-Bishop of St. *Andrews* who was the first Inventaer of the name of Council-Curats, and did so convey the casting of this spark, that he might not be seen to be the kindler and caster of it, and how pleasant it was to these of the Prelatick party, to see the flame kindled by this little spark, running, as the Historian speaks, like Moorburn among the People. If the Historian, I say, and these of his way had known this, it may be they would have taken less pleasure in this Moorburn, which was so pleasant to these to whom the Historian, I suppose, did not desire to make sport.

Then he alledges, that some suppressed their judgment about the Indulgence, out of a preposterous affection to the Brethren Indulged, whom they much honoured and esteemed, and that deservedly, for their eminent endowments, and sometimes usefulness in the Church, or out of a tender care of keeping up Union, and guarding against all motions apparently tending to troublesome distractions and divisions : And it's not unlike, says he, that many were really in the dark, as to the thing, but however light is light, whoever they be that bring it, how inconsiderable soever the Instruments be, who are employed, and whether they come sooner or later ; the light when it's come, should be made welcome, because of him who sent it, &c.

Ans. These Brethren not onely were, but are yet useful, notwithstanding of all his endeavours to
render

tender them useles: And affection to them is not preposterous, but a commended Duty; for whatever Infirmities they be compassed about with, yet they should be esteemed very highly in love for their works sake. I think, when he was speaking of the tender care to keep up Union, and to prevent Division, his heart should have smitten him, who hath been so untender and so careless in this matter. It's true, light is light; but,

1. There may be an unseasonable bringing forth of light, as if a man would bring a light to a large dark Room, where a man fleeing for his Life, had hid himself, to let the pursuer see to find and murder the lurking man: Or if one told what way an innocent man had fled, to his Enemy, who were pursuing for his Life; though Light be Light, and Truth Truth, yet that Light was unseasonably brought in to the dark Room, and that Truth unseasonably brought forth. But ye will say, that doth not hold as to truths revealed in the Scripture. I shall Answer in the words of Mr. *Durham*, whose memory is precious in the Churches, in his *Treatise concerning Scandal*, which was his Testament to the Church of *Scotland*, Part 4. Chap. 11. Pag. 358.

'A second way of composure, is, when such agreement in judgment cannot be obtained, to endeavour a harmony, and keep Unity, notwithstanding of that difference, by a mutual forbearance in things controverted, which we will find to be of two sorts.

'The first is to say so, total; that is, when neither side doth so much as Doctrinally in writ, word, or sentences of Judicatories, press any thing that
'may

' may confirm or propagate their own Opinion, or
 ' condemn the contrary, but do altogether abstract
 ' from the same, out of respect to the Churches
 ' Peace, and for the preventing of Scandal; and do
 ' in things, wherein they agree, according to the
 ' Apostles direction, *Phil. 3. 16. Walk by the same*
 ' *Rule, and mind the same things mutually, as if there*
 ' *were no such differences, and waiting in these, till*
 ' *the Lord shall reveal the same unto them.*

' This way is safe, and where the Doctrine upon
 ' which the difference is, is such, as the forbearing
 ' the decision thereof, doth neither marr any Duty
 ' that the Church in general is called to, nor endan-
 ' ger the Salvation of Souls through the want of
 ' clearness therein; nor in a word infer such incon-
 ' veniences, to the hurt of the Church, as such un-
 ' seasonable awakening, and keeping up of differ-
 ' ences and divisions may have with it: Because the
 ' scope of bringing forth every truth, or confirming
 ' the same by any Authoritative Sanction, &c. is the
 ' Edification of the Church, and therefore when the
 ' bringing forth thereof doth destroy more than Edi-
 ' fie, it is to be forborn: Neither can it be ground
 ' enough to plead for such decisions in Preaching,
 ' that the thing they Preach for is Truth, and the
 ' thing they condemn is Error.

' Because, 1. It is not the Lawfulness of the thing
 ' simply that is in Question, but the necessity and ex-
 ' pediency thereof in such a case; now many things
 ' are lawful, that are not expedient, 1 Cor. 10.
 ' 23.

' 2. In these differences that were in the Primitive
 ' times concerning Meats, Days, Genealogies, &c.
 ' there

‘there was a truth or an error upon one of the sides;
 ‘as there is a right and a wrong in every contra-
 ‘diction of such a kind, yet the Apostle thinketh
 ‘fitter for the Churches Peace, that such be alto-
 ‘gether refrained, rather than any way, at least in
 ‘publick, insisted upon or decided.

‘3. Because no Minister can bring forth every
 ‘Truth at all times, he must then make choice; and
 ‘I suppose some Ministers may die, and all do so;
 ‘who have not Preached every truth, even which
 ‘they knew, unto the People. Beside, there are
 ‘(no question) many truths hid to the most Learn-
 ‘ed, neither can this be thought inconsistent with a
 ‘Ministers fidelity, who is to reveal the whole Coun-
 ‘sel of God, because that Counsel is to be under-
 ‘stood of things necessary to mens Salvation, and
 ‘is not to be extended to all things whatsoever; for
 ‘we find the great Apostle expounding this in that
 ‘same Sermon, *Acts 20. 20. I have kept back no-*
 ‘*thing that was profitable unto you;* which evi-
 ‘denceth that the whole Counsel of God, or the
 ‘things which he shewed unto them, is the whole
 ‘and all that was profitable for them; and that for
 ‘no by-respect or fear whatsoever, he shunned to
 ‘reveal that unto them.

‘Also it’s clear, that there are many truths which
 ‘are not decided by any Judicial Act; and among
 ‘other things, sparingness to decide truths, which
 ‘are not fundamental judicially, hath been ever
 ‘thought no little mean of the Churches Peace, as
 ‘the contrary hath been of Division.

‘The third way (which is the second sort of the
 ‘former) of compofure, is mixed, when there is

'some meddling with such questions, yet with such
 'forbearance, that though there be a seen difference,
 'yet there is no Schism or Division, but that is se-
 'riously and tenderly prevented; as upon the one
 'side, some may express their mind in Preaching and
 'Writing on a particular Question, one way, others
 'may do it differently; yet both with that respect
 'and meekness to those they differ from, that it doth
 'beget no rent, nor give just ground of offence,
 'nor marr Union, in any other thing; or it may
 'possibly come to be decided in a Synod, yet with
 'such forbearance upon both sides, that it may prove
 'no prejudice to Union. Those who have Autho-
 'rity for them, not pressing it, to the prejudice of
 'the Opinion, Names, Consciences of the other,
 'or to their detriment in any respect; but allowing
 'to them a liberty to speak their minds, and walk
 'according to their own light in such particulars;
 'and on the contrary, the other resting satisfied in
 'the Unity of the Church, without condemning
 'them, or pressing them to condemn themselves,
 'because so indeed their Liberty is no less than
 'others, who have the decision of a Synod for them.

And he adds an instance in the Church of *Africa*,
 where that Question was first debated, 'If Here-
 'ticks after their Conversion, should be again Bap-
 'tized? And a Synod of 300 Bishops concluded,
 'that they should be re-baptized; yet that Synod
 'carried so, that they did not onely not censure any
 'that dissented, nor pressed them to conform in
 'practise to their judgment, but also did entertain
 'most intimate respect to them, and formality with
 'them. And upon the other side, we do not find
 'any

'any in that Church making a Schism, upon the
 'account of that Judicial erroneous decision, though
 'at least by three several Synods it was ratified; but
 'contenting themselves to have their Consciences
 'free, by retaining their own judgment, and fol-
 'lowing their own practice, till time gave more
 'light, and more occasion to clear that truth.

'And we will never find in the Writings of any
 'time, more affection among Brethren, and more
 'respect to Peace, than was in that Church at that
 'time, amongst those that differed: And there is
 'not any practice more commended in all the
 'Church-History and Writings of the Fathers, than
 'this practice; and partly may be gathered from
 'what was formerly touched out of *Augustine*: And
 'if we will consider the case rationally, we will find
 'that it is not impossible to have Union in a Church,
 'where there is such a difference, and Authorita-
 'tive decision, even supposing that side on which
 'the Error lies, to be approved. For, first, there
 'is no necessity for such as have Authority for them,
 'to press others in their judgment and practice in
 'such things; neither can it be thought that such
 'a decision can of it self satisfy all scruples; nei-
 'ther yet, that men doubtfully may follow.

'Nor lastly, that such Controversies can bear
 'the weight of troubling the Church, by censuring
 'such, as otherways may be faithful; seeing some-
 'times even unfaithful men have been spared with
 'respect to the Churches good, as hath been said.

'And Secondly, upon the other side, such a con-
 'stitution of the Church doth not involve all that
 'keep Communion therein in the guilt thereof, if

'personally they be free, as in the instance of the
 ' *Jewish* Church is clear; where, no question, ma-
 'ny corrupt Acts have been established, yet did it
 'neither make Communion in Worship or Govern-
 'ment to be unlawful, where the matter and man-
 'ner of carriage was Lawful. Beside, this would
 'infer, that no Judicatory could keep Union, where
 'there were contrary votes or a Sentence passed
 'without unanimity, because that is certainly wrong
 'to them who think otherwise, and if so, there
 'could be no Judicatory expected, either in Church
 'or State; for it cannot be expected that they shall
 'be still unanimous, or that the greater part shall
 'cede to the lesser, and rescind their own Act. And
 'suppose there should be such a Division upon one
 'difference, can it be expected, that those who unite
 'upon the divided sides respectively, shall again
 'have no more difference among themselves, and
 'if they have, shall there not be a new Division,
 'and where shall this end? And seeing men must
 'resolve to keep Unity, where there are faults of
 'such a nature, or to have none at all, it is as good
 'to keep it at first, as to be necessitated to it after-
 'ward.

'The Orthodox urge this Argument against the
 ' *Donatists*, who would not keep Union with them,
 'because of pretended corruptions in the proceed-
 'ings of Judicatories and Ordinations; yet were
 'constrained to bear with such amongst themselves,
 'and particularly, to receive and unite with the
 ' *Maximinianists*; whose Communion they had
 'once rejected, though a branch of their own Facti-
 'on, because they saw no end of Divisions, if they
 ' did

‘did not resolve to dispense with such things amongst themselves : And *Augustine* often asserted that they were never able to Answer this Argument, when it was propounded to them; to wit, why they did not give them that same Latitude in keeping communion with them, which they had given to the *Maximinianists*, who were guilty of such things as they imputed to them? We conceive then, that even in such a case, there may be Union, for prosecuting the main work of the Gospel, notwithstanding of such a Circumstantial difference, if men otherwise set themselves to it, and the general grounds formerly laid down do confirm this.

Thus far I have transcribed the words of the Godly, Learned, Peaceable Mr. *Durham*. I would desire the Reader to read also his 12th. Chapter, and his whole Book, which is a precious Treasure, which if the Historian had pondered and practised, he, and they who follow him, might through the Lords Blessing, been kept out of these divisive and destructive ways.

If the Historian would have followed Mr. *Durham*’s Advice, first, he might have forbore to vent, and to press others to vent this which he calls Light, thought it had been Light indeed : For it is no Fundamental truth, that he and they call Light : He cannot charge the Indulged Ministers, that they maintain Doctrinally any *Erastian* Error : All that he alledges upon them, when he explains himself, is, that they have by their practice Interpretatively homologate the Supremacy.

Now seeing these Ministers taught no erroneous Doctrine concerning the Magistrates Power about

Church-matters; but maintain the Principles of all Orthodox *Anti-erastian* Divines: And seeing they are known to be conscientious men, and declare upon all occasions, that their practice in making use of the Indulgence, is not contrary to, but consistent with and according to the Principles of these *Anti-erastian* Divines. The most that the Author could make out of this, was, that they were mistaken in the application of these Principles to that particular Fact of acceptance of the Peaceable exercise of their Ministry from the Magistrate.

Now what necessity was there in venting this Light? This Interpretative homologation of the Supremacy, which yet is but confounding darkness to the poor People, who know not what he means by these words by which he explains, how these Ministers are guilty, they cannot Interpret his Interpretative homologation: His light is to them darkness. He clears these Indulged Ministers of having any *Erastian* Error in their Head; he grants, they had no ill intention in their mind and heart when they accepted the Indulgence: He grants there was no ill intention in the worker, but in the work done by them; and that what they did, did not formally and explicitly import any approbation of any sinful Supremacy, but onely implicitly, virtually, and interpretatively. What necessity was there of telling the People this implicate Error, in a matter of Fact, seeing, when he tells it most distinctly, it's so subtil a kind of fault, that the People cannot understand it; it's so wompled up in *Latine*, implicate, perplexed words, that they cannot get a sight of it? And though the Historian did really intend
to

to diminish the sin of the Indulged Ministers, when he said they themselves did not intend any ill in their acceptance, but it was onely the intention of the work: And when he said, that the work did not formally and explicitey tend to ill, but virtually, implicitey, and interpretatively: Yet the People are not capable of understanding these diminishing terms; and so thinking it to be some ill thing, these words that are unintelligible by them, increases the apprehension of the illness or evil of it; even as when simple People knows that the thing commended is good, if ye commend it in words that they do not understand, it heightens their conceit of the goodness of it. What effect could the Historian think that this dark light could have upon the minds and affections of the poor People, but to beget an ill Opinion of, and prejudice against, and hatred of these honest men, who, as he grants himself, meant no ill. Now, did this any way tend to the Peoples Edification? Did it not, upon the contrary, tend to their hurt? For, whereas before they were Edified by the Ministry of these Ministers, they are put in an incapacity of getting that good by their Ministry, which they were wont formerly to get; so that they are no way Edified, but prejudged, and their Edification hindred.

But 2. If he would have been Advised by Mr. *Durham*, he might well have forbore to have vented this light, because the forbearance of venting it could no way have endangered the Salvation of the Souls of the People, nor marred them in any Duty that the Church in general is called to, nor could he in Reason think, that the withholding of

this light could have so many inconveniencies following upon it, as the venting of it would have, by an unseasonable awakening and keeping up of Divisions, and all the mischiefs which follow upon Divisions.

3. If he would needs vent this Light of his, and press others to do the like, he might have done it in the way which Mr. *Durham* points out, viz. with that meekness, tenderness, and respect towards his Brethren who differed from him, that the difference might make no Division, nor marr Union. But he is so far from this, that he will have this Light, and those who bring it, made welcome, though it be brought for this very end to make Division, and to distract and rent the Church.

But 4. The worst of all is, this Light of his is not Light, but Darkness; a confused mass of false Calumnies, published to scatter the poor sheep, and drive them away from their faithful Pastours, who fed them with knowledge and understanding. If they who will not forbear to vent Truths, which are not necessary, when the venting of them is unseasonable; or if they, who will vent such Truths in a factious and divisive way, be justly censurable, O! how hateful is their temper, or rather distemper, who cannot be perswaded for Peace-sake, to with-hold their Lies and Calumnies, but will vent them, upon design, to rent the Church, in drawing away the People from the Lords Ministers, and the Lords Ordinances. They who come to publish untruths, to make Discord and Division, come not by the Commission of the God of Truth and Peace. I shall again transcribe some of Mr.

Durham's

Durham's words, in his excellent Exposition of the Song of Solomon, Chap. I. v. 8. pag. 91. —

6. Believers would make use of publick Ordinances and Christs Ministers, especially in reference to snares and errors, and they would take their directions from them, and their Counsel would be laid weight upon.

7. Allowed dependance on a Ministry is a great mean to keep Souls from error, whereas on the contrary, when no weight is laid on a Ministry, unstable Souls are hurried away.

8. Christ hath given no immediate or extraordinary way to be sought unto, and made use of, even by his Bride in her difficulties; but the great mean he will have her to make use of, is a sent Ministry, and therefore no other is to be expected. It's no wonder then, that the Devil (when his design is to cry down Truth, and spread Error) seek to draw the Lords People from the Shepherds Tents; and no wonder, that Souls who do cast off respect to their Overseers, be hurried away with the temptations of the times, as in experience hath often been found a truth.

9. Ministers should have a special eye on the weakest of the flock; their care should be, that the Kids may be next them: Our blessed Lord doth so, When the Lambs are carried in his own bosom, Isa. 40. 11. And therefore seeing weak Believers have most need of Christs oversight, if they begin to slight the Ministry and Ordinances, they cannot but be a ready Prey, and the Devil hath gained much of his intent, when he hath once gained that. O! that men would try whose voice it is, that saith, Come back from the Shepherds Tents, when Christ says, abide near

abide near them; it's as if a Wolf would desire the Lambs to come out from under the Shepherds eye.

And lastly, when Christ gives this direction to his own Bride, we may see he allows none to be above Ordinances in the Militant Church; it will be soon enough then, when they are brought to Heaven, and put above the reach of Seducers.

In these words, that Holy man of God, who was a burning and shining light, who had the mind of Christ, and the bowels of Christ, doth clearly from the words of Christ warn us, that the voice which saith, *Come back from the Shepherds Tents*, is not the voice of Christ; this is not light from the Sun of Righteousness, from the face of Christ; but darkness from the Prince of darkness, who can transform himself into an Angel of Light.

Obj. 4. *All or most of the Non-indulged, Faithful, and Zealous Ministers in the Land, are for bearing of the Indulged; and onely a few, and those of the younger sort, with the ignorant People are against it.*

He Answers, That he would hope few should lay weight on this Objection, and thinks it enough to refer any such to consider *John 7. 47, 48, 49.* with Mr. *Hutcheson's* Notes, especially 7 and 9, and then tells us, that in all the parts of our Tryal, God hath made use of the nothings, to break the ice to others. And in the Introduction to his 28 Questions, he says, *That in all our carriage, that is this day approveable, as to the grounds of our Suffering, the Lord hath (for the most part) made the poor flock go before the Shepherds, and lead the way to them, rather than the Guides to break the Ice, and lead the way to the flock, as might have been expected.*

I reply,

I reply: His hope is as groundless and reasonless as his imaginations, but he would hope his affection guides his hope, *Credimus an quia amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt.* And indeed it seems he was dreaming when he hoped that more weight would or should be laid upon the Opinion and Practice of a few young Preachers, and of the ignorant People, than on the judgment and practice of all, not onely Indulged Ministers, but of all or most of the Non-indulged, Faithful, and Zealous Ministers. And I know none who will joyn with him in this Dream, except it be such, who love to be singular, and hope to be more noticed and talked of, when they take odd and singular ways, and who lay down that for a Principle, that the fewest number, especially if they be in greatest hazard and danger, must certainly be right, and all others wrong. And when their party grows numerous, they grow suspicious, that all is not right, and so they break again, as the *English Separatists* did at *Amsterdam*.

Any may see how strongly this Historian hath been Acted by a spirit of Division, seeing he with a few young men, take upon them, by themselves, without the knowledge and concurrence; yea, contrary to the known and declared mind of all or most of the Non-indulged, Faithful, Zealous Ministers, to drive the poor People upon the Rock of Schism, contrary to the Word of God, and to the Covenant. Many of the Non-indulged thought it fit to forbear to move that Question about the acceptance of the Indulgence in their Sermons, to the People; they knew weak People, though they be well inclined, yet, having, as Children, strong Passions, and
little

little knowledge, and less prudence, to direct their affections, can hardly differ and not divide. Some others, who did touch upon that Question, yet were against Separation; but now perceiving that the People have gone further than they intended, are, I suppose, grieved that they should have started that Question at all among them; and if it were to do again, would be better advised, and are very desirous to have the divisive Distempers of the People cured, and the Preachers of Schism discountenanced. And yet this Historian, with two or three of the younger sort, would contrary to the mind and heart, to the tears and prayers of all his Brethren, increase the Disease, which they were studying to cure, and encourage these rash and inconsiderate Youths to cast more fire-brands, and add Oyl to the flame.

I have considered the 47, 48, 49 Verses of the 7th. Chap. of *John*, with Mr. *H*'s Notes, and the more I consider it, I think it the more impertinently alledged: For these *Pharisees* and Rulers were Enemies of Christ; they believed not themselves, and they endeavoured to hinder others to believe on Christ, and are enraged that the People did believe on him. Now, the Ministers of whom he is speaking, are not Enemies of Christ, but his Servants, and faithful Servants, and zealous for his Glory, and are so far from hindering People from believing in Christ, or from looking on them, as ignorant and cursed, upon that account, that they study to bring People to believe in Christ, and are grieved that this Author and his Associates withdraws them from Christ, by withdrawing them from his Ordinances, where he comes and blesses his People, and is in the
midst

midst of them, and withdraws them from hearing these, whom Christ sends to Preach to them, and so hinders them from believing, for Faith comes by hearing, and it increases by hearing. Mr. H. takes notice, that these *Pharisees* were puffed up; and I leave it to the consideration of the Reader, if the way of these Faithful and Zealous Ministers seems not to be farther from this, than the way that this Historian hath taken in this History. He shews it's an old Engine to keep men from Christ, by the opposition of able and eminent Church-men: But the stress of the Argument, which he proposes to answer, did not lie most upon that, that they were Church-men in eminent place, of great parts; but on that, that they were Faithful and Zealous Ministers: and that they were not seeking themselves, or their own things, but the things of Christ, and the Edification of the Body of Christ, appears in this, that they are not like the Historians Youths, who cry down all but themselves, and draws away the People from all others, to hear themselves, and tells the People, there is a cursed thing in other Meetings, and warns them to beware of it: But their Faithful Ministers does not seek to engross all the Peoples affection to themselves, but they are for their hearing of others; they behave, as the Lords Ministers were wont to do in the Primitive times, and as we find the Apostles doing in their Epistles, they commend and recommend their fellow-labourers to the Churches, and strengthens their hands.

Again, these *Pharisees* took it as an evidence of the Ignorance and Misery of the People, that they believed on Christ. These who speak of the Ignorance

norance of the People, who withdraw from hearing Indulged Ministers, are far from thinking them Ignorant and Cursed upon that account: But they know, that many of them are very ignorant of Christ, and of the way of Salvation; and it's sad to them that are drawn away from the means of Knowledge, Preaching, and Catechising, from learning the grounds of Religion, and their Heads filled with vain janglings: And they learn not to know their own sins, in order to their Humiliation and Self-denial, but learns to know the sins of others more than their own, and that readily puffs them up.

What he adds, about the Peoples guiding and breaking the Ice, it blows up the People with a conceit that God hath made them Guides and Leaders, to go before the Ministers, and made the Sheep to lead the Shepherds. There was enough of wind in this Bladder before; the Historian might have without any hazard, spared his breath here, and not blown up the People with the ill wind of an anti-scriptural conceit. When the Lord guides his People in his way, he guides them according to his Word, in the use of the means that he himself hath appointed; he leads his People, like a Flock, by the hand of *Moses* and *Aaron*; and for my part, when I observe, that these whom the Lord hath not made Guides, and Leaders, and Shepherds wilfully refusing to be guided and led by these whom God hath made Guides and Shepherds, and confidently taking upon them to lead their Leaders. I am very suspicious, that all is not right, and that both the Leaders, and they who are led by them, are wrong. But this is an old trick used by these who stir up
Peo-

People to Schism or Sedition, to give the People fair words, and make much of them. *Corah, Dathan,* and *Abiram* do highly complement the People; *All the Congregation*, say they, *is holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them.* Such fair words will easily beguile unstable Souls. I remember a judicious and sober Countrey-man said of one of these Preachers, who made it a great part of his work to draw away the People from hearing Indulged Ministers, *That he thought he clapped the Bairns heads too much.* The Historian was mistaken, if he thought, that withdrawing from the Indulged Ministers had it's rise from the People; for it was some Preachers, who by private conferences, and publick Preaching drew them away. He alledges, that the matter about hearing the Curats, is a sufficient instance of the Peoples good guiding: Yea, I perceive, by what he says, that he would not follow the Peoples guiding, even in this matter, for he does not think the Baptisms administrated by them, to be no Baptisms: But some of the People have thought their Baptism to be the mark of the Beast, and that's much worse than nothing. He does not think the hearing of Curats simply unlawful, and thinks, if there were no other to hear, they should be heard. But some of the leading People have thought the hearing of them simply unlawful. I heard of some, who said, that the hearing of them was as unlawful as Fornication, Adultery, as the Worshipping of the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*: And I suppose, the Historian will not deny, that Fornication, &c. are simply unlawful. Some have been so far from thinking, that hearing them could ever
become

become Lawful, that they have placed their Religion and Sincerity in this. A Minister informed me, that when he was enquiring concerning the estate of a dying woman, he got no other account of any Evidence, that it was well, or would be well with her, but this, that she had never heard a Curate; and I suppose, the Historian would have looked on this as a Soul-deluding and destructive Error, to make that an Evidence of Sincerity, which a Lazy, Profane, Atheistical Person can so easily forbear, and that from a Principle of Laziness, Profanity, or Atheism. From this it appears, that the People are none of the best Guides, in the matter of hearing, seeing they have been so far from breaking the Ice in the right Foord, that they have broken it above Whirlpools, and have plunged themselves so palpably, that the Historian himself could not follow them. And I am so far from seeing sufficient Evidences of the Peoples good guiding of their Guides, that I am very hopeful, that all sober People will, upon serious consideration of the Errors and Confusions that some People, who would needs guide matters, have run unto, will acknowledge, that it is the good and acceptable will of God, that every one should keep within the bounds of their own vocation, and not take upon them that which the Lord hath not called them to, and that the sheep should not lead the Shepherds, but be led by them. And I suppose that several Ministers have by sad experience found, that they have been indeed led upon the Ice, by following the humours of some head-strong leading People, who were fitter to break themselves and the hearts of their Ministers, than to break the Ice to make safe passage for their followers.

The

The 5th. Object. *Now when we are in hazard to be over-run with Popery, is it seasonable, that such Questions should be started to break the remnant in pieces, and thereby to make all a Prey to the man of sin? Were it not better that we were all united as one, to withstand the Inundation?*

He Answereth, *That he fears, that the Lord by Popery and Blood will avenge the quarrel of his Covenant, and the contempt of the Gospel.* I Reply, He should have remembred, that we did covenant to extirpate Schism, which he endeavours to plant and water in this History. And hath he not exposed the Gospel to contempt, in tempting the People to cast off all the Indulged Ministers, as no Ministers of Christ, and all almost, who are not Indulged, as acted by the spirit of Supremacy, the spirit of Anti-christ? He could not have taken a more compendious way to render the Preaching of the Gospel contemptible, than to render the Ministers of the Gospel contemptible. Then he Advises, *That we should — acknowledge our selves the basest of sinners.* This Advice is good, but his Schismatick directions are contrary to it: A Schismatick Spirit is a proud and self-conceited Spirit. They who see themselves the basest of sinners, would, if they could, rather separate from themselves, than others; they will, in lowliness of mind, esteem others better than themselves; they will acknowledge themselves less than the least of mercies, unworthy of any remnant of the Lords Ordinances, unworthy to whom the Lord should send any of his Messengers; such will be far from casting at any of the Lords Servants or Ordinances.

Then, he says, *Union, so long as the accursed thing*

is amongst us, is a Conspiracy. I suppose, the Indulgence is the accursed thing which he means; but the Magistrates permitting and allowing the peaceable exercise of the Ministry is a good thing: This is a curse of his own making, a causeless curse; this is one of the tricks of the Devil, to divert People from taking notice of the sins they are really guilty of, by bogling them with imaginary sins, alledging, that there is sin wrapped up in hearing the Ministers of the Gospel Preach the Gospel; and so he turns Duty to sin, and by making them take up the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, under the protection of Lawful Authority, as if it were a curse or cursed thing; and so flegging poor People, that they flee from, and forsake their own mercies; and it's a dreadful delusion to mistake blessings, as if they were curses. He adds, *If we be not tender of Christs headship, and of what depends thereupon, and of the least pin of his Tabernacle pitched among us* — I Answer; If he had been more tender of Christ, as head of his Church, he would have been more tender of the Union of the Members of his Body, and would have been afraid to have rent the members of that Body asunder. His divisive Doctrine looses all the pins of the Tabernacle, he hath cast fire into the Lords Tabernacle, which, if the Lord prevent not, may burn up the Synagogues of God in the Land. His Doctrine tends to dissolve all Meetings for the publick Worship of God, except these, who meet at the Separate Meetings, moulded after his conceit.

He Prophesieth, *That they who follow his way, shall find a shelter and a Chamber of Protection.* But, he

he hath been so far mistaken in taking up things past and present, they are not wise who will believe him, when he Prophesies of things to come; a false Historian is not an Infallible Prophet: He is so far wrong in his Precepts for Direction, that I have no Faith to believe his promises of Protection. He recommends Union upon the old grounds of our received and sworn Principles and Maximes: But they who know these old grounds, see his grounds to be the grounds of the *English Brownists*, which were solidly refuted by the old Non-Conformists. Next,

He threatneth, *That if there be not an Union in the way that he prescribes; that is, if there be not a Separation from these Congregations, where Indulged Ministers are, and also from these Meetings where Non-indulged Ministers, who are for bearing Indulged Ministers Preach* (for he Reproaches these Ministers also, as Acted by the Spirit of Supremacy, the Spirit of Anti-christ) *that then this Division from his Separated party will be the certain fore-runner of a dark and dismal Dispensation.* And then he Advises every man that would have Peace in the day of Gods contending against these back-sliders and revolvers, *to mourn for this Abomination of the Indulgence, among other Abominations, and to adhere to the Lord, and to our Principles, which the Lord hath owned and countenanced, though he should be in a manner left alone.*

Ans. This Division and Schismatick renting of the Lords People, this driving of them away from the Lords Ordinances, is more than a fore-runner of a dark and dismal Dispensation; it's an Evidence of the continuance of the Lords Anger,

and that *his hand is stretched out still*. Schism is a grievous sin, a dreadful plague, which uses to end in ruine and desolation; and they who drive on this vile and destructive Schism, and scare the Lords People from joyning together in the Worship of God, they are back-sliders and revolvers from the Principles and Covenant of true Presbyterians: They adhere not to the Lord, who hath commanded his People not to forsake the Assembling of themselves together, and hath promised to be with them, when met in his Name, and to come and bless them, where he Records his Name, and to be with his Servants, Preaching and Baptizing in his Name, to the end of the World. They who forsake the Ordinances, in which the Lord hath trysted a meeting betwixt himself and his People, they who will not come where the Lord comes, they who will be absent, where the Lord promises to be present, and where he commands his People to present themselves before him, they do not adhere unto the Lord, but depart from the presence of the Lord; and they who run away from the Society of the People of God, they are not left alone, but have left their Company, they have left the Shepherds Tents, and wander alone, as a Lamb in a large place, as a bewildered Lamb, which being alone, is a prey to every Wild Beast; and woe to him, who is, and will be thus alone. It is above sufficiently cleared, that the Magistrate, as Magistrate, is the Minister of God for good: As the Nursing-father of the Church, not only may, but should take off Civil restraints that hinder the peaceable exercise of the Ministry of the Servants of Christ, and should grant

to Ministers the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, and take care that the Lords People in his Dominions, be fed with the sincere Milk of the Word of God; and that it is the Duty of Ministers to accept thankfully of the peaceable publick exercise of their Ministry, when the Magistrate grants it; and to make the Magistrates Duty in allowing the Preaching of the Gospel in his Dominions, or the Ministers Duty in making use of the Magistrates grant of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, in Preaching the Gospel, or to make the Peoples Duty, in hearing the Gospel Preached by these Ministers, an Abomination, to be mourned for, is to teach People to pervert their own Mercies, and to turn them to Curses, and to divert them from laying to heart real Abominations, which are real causes of mourning, to mourn for that, for which they should give thanks. Such false visions are matter of mourning, and were among *Jeremiah's* Lamentations, *Lam. 2. 14.* *Thy Prophets have seen vain and foolish things for thee, and they have not discovered thine iniquity, to turn away thy Captivity; but have seen for thee false burdens, and causes of Banishment.* The good old Principles of Presbyterians did not lead them to despise Dignities, they feared God and honoured Rulers, and did humbly Supplicate for Liberty for Preaching the Gospel, and did thankfully accept of any such Liberty, when it was granted by the Magistrate.

He adds, pag. 162. *Will not, I pray, many of these who have complied with Prelacy, and with the courses that have been carried on, profess an abhorrence at Popery? And is this ground sufficient for us*

to think of uniting with them, notwithstanding of all they have done, that we may be the more fortified to withstand that torrent?

Ans. What is the importance of his praying in this place : Or if it be an idle insignificant word, is not worth the enquiry : But it may be he was sensible that his Arguments had no force to convince his Readers judgment and Conscience, and therefore he makes use of earnest Supplication to work upon his Readers Affections ; that what he could not extort by the strength of Reason, he might obtain it by importunate praying and begging of the Question ; and so gain the thing in question, by requesting as Beggars, who have no price to purchase what they would be at, do importunately seek what they cannot buy ; and thus he would have the Question, *Si non justo pretio, saltem prece & precariò.* When his praying is done, let us see what he says to the Cause : His Reasoning is to this purpose. If the professed abhorrence of Popery be no sufficient ground for us to think of uniting with these who have complied with Prelacy, that we may be the more fortified to withstand the torrent of Popery, then the Presbyterians may break off that Fellowship in the Worship of God, which they had in these Congregations, where Indulged Ministers Preach, and may disown these Ministers, whom they once owned as Ministers, and their Ministers, and withdraw from hearing them, whom they invited to Preach to them, and whom they did hear and countenance in the exercise of their Ministry. But so it is, that the abhorrency of Popery, professed by these who have complied with Prelacy, &c. is no sufficient ground of

Uniting

Uniting Presbyterians with these compliers, and therefore Presbyterians should break off, &c.

The connexion is very ill knit, it's loose work; for although the professed abhorrency of Popery, and the design of withstanding Popery, were not sufficient to make up Union betwixt the Presbyterians and the Prelatick party, it would not follow, that Presbyterians who are United in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, should break off their Communion in the Worship of God, and, as it is in the Objection, by breaking themselves in pieces, expose themselves as a Prey to the Man of Sin; there is no shadow of Reason for this Consequence: For this ground of Uniting Presbyterians and compliers with Prelacy, may be insufficient, and yet there may be a vile Schism in Presbyterians breaking themselves in pieces.

Although the Invasion of a common Enemy be not thought a sufficient ground of Uniting two distinct Parties in a Nation, yet it may be a very strong motive to keep these of the several Parties United in these things, in which they are United, and it should keep them from making sub-divisions, for the more Divisions, the Nation is the more weakened, and the more exposed as a Prey to the Invader.

It seems the Author hath been against all sort of Uniting with these who comply with Prelacy. It's true, Presbyterians should not Unite with them, in their compliance with Prelacy, nor joyn with them in any ill course: But there are many things wherein we may Unite with Papists themselves; do not Protestants joyn with Papists against the *Jews*, in

believing that the *Messiah* is come? If an *Arrian* were like to put a Popish Doctor out, would it not be the Duty of a Protestant Minister, if he were present, to assist the Popish Doctor, in maintaining the Trinity, and the Deity of the Son of God? May not Papists and Protestants Unite in defending their Native Countrey against the *Turks*? May not Christians Unite with Pagans, in doing some work of necessity? *Paul* wrought with the Pagans, with whom he sailed, in casting out the tackling of the Ship. May not Christians joyn with Pagans, in saving and helping Ship-broken men to shore? May not, should not Protestants, whether they be Non-conformists, or Conformists, joyn together in the abhorrency of Popery, and in withstanding the current of it? Would the Historian have Protestants more demented than the very *Jews*, when they were Judicially plagued with intestine Divisions and Seditions, while the *Romans* besieged *Jerusalem*; yet they had so much sense remaining, that they left off their inward fightings when the *Romans* made any Assault, and joyned together in defending the Walls of the City. We must abhor what is evil in men, and must have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness; but we should not abhor that which is good, even in Papists or Pagans. Mr. *Rutherford*, in his *Peaceable Plea for Pauls Presbytery in Scotland*, Chap. 10. pag. 124. Consideration 8. Says, *We Separate not from men, but Errors; we Separate from Papism kindly, properly, and totally; from Christian Articles in no sort.* And pag. 123. *We have not Separate from Rome's Baptism and Ordination of Pastours,*

flows, according to the Substance of the Act, nor from the letter of the twelve Articles of the Creed; and Contents of the Old and New Testament, as they stand with relation to the mind and intent of the Holy Ghost: Howbeit, we have left the false Interpretations of the Lords of poor Peoples Faith and Conscience.

The Historian himself in some cases grants, that we should joyn in the Worship of God with these who comply with Prelacy, notwithstanding of all they have done, as we saw from his concessions in the stating of the Question; and yet here he speaks, as if all Uniting with them were sinful. If the hearing of these who have complied with Prelacy, be at any time a Duty, then the hearing of them is no compliance with Prelacy; and if the hearing of them who have really complied with Prelacy, be not a compliance with Prelacy; then suppose the Indulged Ministers had really complied with an *Erastian* Power in the Magistrate, yet the hearing of the Indulged Ministers would not have been any compliance with *Erastianism*. How much then is this Historian in the wrong, to the poor People, who would fright them from hearing the Indulged Ministers, who have never complied with any *Erastian* Power, or sinful Supremacy in the Magistrate, as if the hearing of the Word of God Preached by them, were sinful, a homologating of a sinful Supremacy.

He adds, *Alas, this our strength will prove our weakness; let us remember that of Esay 8. 11, 12, 13, 14.* He means, that Uniting in the Worship of God in these paroches, where Indulged Ministers

sters are settled, is our weakness, and so that it's Peoples strength to withdraw from the Worship of God in these Paroches. This must be his meaning, or he says nothing to the purpose in hand. This is one of the Historians Paradoxes, that Union in the true Worship of God, is the Churches weakness; and that the breaking off that Union, is the Churches strength. That is to say, a Church divided shall stand: It seems, a Church is not like other Societies, for our Saviour says, *A House and Kingdom divided cannot stand.* This is a pitiful Paradox, for it's contrary to Scripture, Reason, Common Sense, Experience; and the Author brings no shadow of Reason to give it any colour of probability, but as he began his last Reason with praying, so he Ushers in this pitiful Paradox with lamentation, that seeing it had nothing in it, nor upon it, to plead for it's admission, it might be received of meer pity. He should have considered, that a Printed Book would readily come to the hands of Rational men, who regard not Passions that are void of Reason, and who will not be prayed or lamented out of their wits: Yet this will pass currant among weak People, who will be more moved with an Oh, or an Alas, than with ten solid Reasons or Scripture-Testimonies.

The Scripture which he exhorts us to remember, makes nothing for withdrawing from hearing the Word of God Preached by the Lords Ministers: When the Lord Instructed the Prophet, *That he should not walk in the way of that People, nor say a Confederacy to all them, to whom that People said a Confederacy.* He did not discharge the Prophet to hear the Word of God, or to joyn with the Lords
People

People in the Worship of God. The way of Gods Ordinances is the way of God, in which the Lords goings are, and in which his People walk with him, and in which he hath commanded them to walk; but the way of that People was their sinful ways, ways of their own which were not Gods ways; the Confederacy discharged was not joyning together in the Lords Ordinances, for the Lord had commanded his People to Assemble together for his Solemn Worship, *Deut. 12. 11, 12, 13. Deut. 15. 19, 20. Deut. 16. 7, 8. 16. 17.* But the Confederacy discharged, is a Confederacy with the King of *Assyria.*

He cites *Amos 4. 12, 13.* Where the Lord directs his People to *prepare to meet their God.* This Scripture is as little to the Historians purpose as the former, for the way to meet with God, is not to withdraw from the Worship of God; but upon the contrary, they who would meet with God, must come to his Ordinances, for there he meets with them, *Exod. 25. 22. Exod. 29, 42, 43.* He hath said, *That they who hear his Servants, hear himself, and hath blessed these who hear him, and watch daily at his gates, and wait at the Posts of his Doors.* That's the way to find him, to find Life, &c. *Prov. 8. 32, 33.* He hath promised, that where he Records his Name, he will come to his People and bless them. Separation from the Lords Ordinances is no preparation to meet with God, but it is a departing from God: And if this Separation from the Lords People, and from his Worship, be comprehended under the Separating of our selves from every sinful course, the Christian compliance which he speaks

speaks of, is an unchristian mis-application of that word in the 4th. of *Amos*: And if he thought that they who have heard the Indulged Ministers, must utterly forsake that way, as a way provoking the Lord to wrath, he was quite out, and utterly mistaken about this utter forsaking.

The Scripture with which he closeth, *Zeph. 2. 1, 2, 3.* is not for his scattering of the Lords People, but for the gathering of them together to the Solemn Worship of God. If the Author had pondered this Scripture, and observed the directions of the Spirit of the Lord, which are given in it, he would not have endeavoured to scatter the Lords People; and if he had made more Conscience of seeking Righteousness, he would not have done so many and great wrongs and injuries to his innocent Brethren, who had done him no wrong, and who were doing right things; and if he had made more Conscience of seeking Meekness, he would have been more quiet, and either altogether been silent, or spoken and written of these things with more calmness and composure of Spirit: If meekness (as they say) were lost, it would be a hard work to find it in this History, in which there is much of the wrath of man, which perfects not the Righteousness of God. He concludes well with two Petitions of the Lords Prayer, *Thy Kingdom come, thy Will be done.* If he had looked to the Exposition of the Second Petition of the Lords Prayer in the larger Catechism, he would have found, that this is a part of the meaning of that Petition, that the Church may be countenanced and maintained by the Civil Magistrate; and to confirm this, the *1 Tim.*

2. 1, 2. is cited, *I exhort therefore that first of all Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, and Thanksgivings be made for all men, for Kings, and for all that are in Authority: That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all Godliness and Honesty.* Which shews, that the Assembly of Divines at *Westminster* did not think, that the Kingdom of Christ is to be set up by ruining earthly Kings and Kingdoms, and that they take not the right way to advance Christs Kingdom, who reject the Magistrates countenance, and maintenance of the Church: Or who by despising and provoking Magistrates to wrath, tempts them to discountenance the Church. And seeing they look on the Church as Christs Kingdom, the Historian hath not taken the right way to advance this Kingdom, but hath taken the way to ruine it, by dividing it; *For a Kingdom divided against it self, cannot stand.* And if he had pondered the explication of the third Petition, it might have been a mean to have prevented his giving so much place to his own Humour and Will in this History, and helped him to more submission unto the Holy Providence of God, than doth appear in this History. I wish he had, ere he began to write this History, put up that Petition, *And lead us not into temptation:* Or at the close of it, put up that Petition, *And forgive us our sins.* We have great need, ere we begin Debates and Controversies, even when they are necessary, to pray, that we be not led into temptation: And great need to close such Debates, even when the cause maintained is right, with praying, Lord, forgive us our sins. I have examined all that had any appearance of Reason in this History, and re-
futed

futed many things which needed no refutation, if
 it had not been for the sake of simple People, who
 are often deceived by big words, where there is no
 shew or colour of Reason. I have often by Reason
 refuted the unreasonable clamours, both of the Au-
 thor of the Epistle, and of the History; whereas
 I might have opposed clamour to clamour, for what
 is founded upon meer clamour, may be as easily cried
 down as it's cried up. Let none because of the Au-
 thors errors in this History, cast at other useful Books
 which he hath published; nor reject any thing that
 is true and right in this History. Good men have
 their failings, and we may not take our measures of
 them from their miscarriages under a fit of temp-
 ration. *Job's* Friends had a just hatred against Hy-
 pocrisie, and they mistake *Job*, and falls foul upon
 him, as a Hypocrite, and speaks many things that
 are not right things, in the heat of Debate. This
 Author had a just indignation against *Erastianism*,
 and a Spiritual Supremacy in Magistrates; and he
 apprehended that his brethren had interpretatively
 homologate this *Erastian* and Spiritual Supream
 power in the Magistrate, and having mistaken
 them, he hath fallen foully upon them, and spoken
 much evil of them without cause. These things
 which in the Epistle and History are wrong, are
 things for the most part, which several people had
 drunk in, and the printing of these errours, hath
 given occasion to rectifie the mistakes of erring peo-
 ple, if they will not shut their eyes against the light.
 The Lord who is excellent in working, draws good
 out of evil, and maketh all things work together
 for good to them who love him, and are the called
 according

according to his purpose he can over-rule the darkness of error, so as it shall be subservient to clear the truth. In the worst times the Elect hath obtained and shall obtain. The Lord reigneth and ruleth in the midst of Enemies, he can when men are scattering the dust of *Zion*, be making way for laying a solid foundation, in the deep humiliation of his people, for building his house : The Church hath been before, as dry and scattered bones, as bones scattered at the graves mouth ; and yet he who raiseth the dead, hath made these bones to come together and live. It's our best to leave the answering of that Question, *Can these Bones live?* To the Lord himself, to *Jehovah, who makes things that are not, to be ; who doeth great things and unsearchable, marvellous things, and without number.* If we would take shame and confusion of face to our selves, and would humble our selves in the sight and sense of our sins, our darkness, and stumblings, and justlings in the dark ; and justify the Lord in his judgments that are come upon us, and yet ascribe to him the glory of his Mercy ; and out of our depths and darkness cry to him, that he would cause his face to shine and enlighten our darkness, and send out his Light and Truth, and pour out the Spirit of a sound mind ; and that he would quicken us by the Spirit of Life, that is in Christ Jesus, that we might call on his Name, *and look on him whom we have pierced and mourn ;* & that when mens endeavours to gather the scattered sheep, are not effectual, that he the great Shepherd would seek out his sheep, and deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark

dark day. And if we would wait on him in the way of his Judgments, and hope in his Word, his Covenant, which he uses to remember for his People, and to repent according to the multitude of his Mercies; and though we have no ground of hope in our selves, yet hope against hope, on the Lord, *who is the hope of Israel, and the Saviour thereof in the time of trouble, and that because with him there is Mercy and plenteous Redemption.* And so continue humbly praying, hoping, waiting for him. He could soon redeem us from all our Iniquities, and all our Troubles, and cure all our distractions and distempers, and give Light, and Life, and Unity, and Peace. Let us take shame to our selves, and give him the glory due to his Name; that his Name may endure for ever, and be continued as long as the Sun, that men may be Blessed in him, and all Nations call him Blessed. *Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who onely doeth wondrous things, And Blessed be his Glorious Name for ever and ever, and let the whole Earth be filled with his Glory. Amen, and Amen.*

The Conference continued.

Farmer. **S**IR, there are many things considerable in this Answer to the History of the Indulgence, which I purpose to consider; but there is one thing which not a little troubles me: That the withdrawing from hearing the Indulged Ministers is called Schism. Now I remember we are by Covenant bound to extirpate Schism, and if I have been practising Schism, in withdrawing from hearing the Indulged Ministers, I have been Acting contrary to the Covenant.

Minister. They who deal truly in the matter of the Covenant, will study to fulfill their Vows, not onely in some things, but in all things.

Schism is a dissolution of that Union which ought to be among Christians, and especially it appears in refusing that Church-fellowship or Ecclesiastical Communion, which ought to be observed, or in an unwillingness to communicate, or to have communion with the true Church in Holy Actions.

Casuits shew, that it is a most grievous sin.

1. Because it is contrary to Charity towards our Neighbour.

2. It is contrary to the Edification of him who Separates, in depriving him of Communion in Spiritual good.

3. It's contrary to the Honour of Christ, as being contrary to the Unity of his Mystical Body.

4. It makes way for Heresie, and Separation from Christ.

If ye would be cleared of the unlawfulness of this Schism, or Separation, in your withdrawing from the Indulged Ministers, and these Congregations where they Preach; or, which is all one, in withdrawing from that Church-communion in the Worship of God, which ye had formerly in these Congregations, as if it were unlawful to joyn with them in the Worship of God: I desire you would read the Writings of the Old Non-Contormists against Separatists; particularly I recommend to you Mr. *Rutherford's Peaceable Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland*, Chap. 10. from pag. 120. to pag. 149. Where he proves that it's unlawful to Separate from the true Church visible for the corruption of Teachers, and the wickedness of Pastours and Professours. Where Faith is begotten by the Preaching of Professed Truth, it is not every Error or Corruption in Ministers or Professours, which will warrant Separation, as he shews. A Minister who Preaches the body of Divinity soundly, howbeit he mixes Errors with it, may be heard, and yet we may be no way defiled with his Error, if we reject it. We are, saith he, to hear the *Pharisees*, but to beware of their leaven, and finding it to be sour and unsound Doctrine, we are to reject it. What think ye would he have judged of your Separation? Seeing ye Separate from a Church, where the Minister, and People who submits to his Ministry, do profess and hold the whole Doctrine of Salvation, contained in the Word of God, and particularly in the Confessions of Faith, of this National Church, and rejects all Errors contrary thereto; they have all the parts of

Wor:

Worship of Divine Institution; and no false Worship.

3. They own and submit to the Discipline of the Church, which is of Divine Institution, and owns no Offices or Officers in the Church of God, but such as the Lord hath appointed to be in his House.

Again, your Separating from a particular Church, where the Worship of God is in every thing according to Christs Institution, is by necessary and undeniable consequence a Separation from all other Churches, where the Worship of God is celebrated according to Christs Institution, and so is a Separation from the Universal Church, and from Christ in it.

The tendency and efficacy of this sinful Separation, may be seen in the mischievous effects of it, in dissolving the Bond of Love, in taking People off from the Duties of Love and mutual Edification, and tends to Malice, Hatred, Envy, Whispering, rash uncharitable judging, Censuring, Lying, Back-biting, Slandering, Reproaching, Defaming, Vain jangling, Strife, Contention, and the evil works which follow thereupon.

This Separation is one of the most groundless Separations that ever was in the Church, and so one of the most vile Schisms that ever hath been heard of. And the more groundless any Separation is; as it is the more sinful, so it produces ordinarily the more sin; for when People have groundlessly Separate, and cannot give an account of the cause of their Separation, and yet will not Repent and return, they are under a dreadful temptation to

make up, or take up false Reproaches and Calumnies against these from whom they Separate, that they may have something to say for themselves; and this increases to more and more ungodliness, and unrighteousness, to Strife, Envy, Confusion, and every evil work.

Farmer. I cannot deny, that some have run into a great height of contempt of Magistrates and Ministers. I confess I am astonished at this late Band and Sanchar Declaration.

Min. The Seeds of the Confusion which is in these Papers, were sown here and there in some Papers, which were before scattered among the People, who did not consider whereto they would grow.

Preacher. I wonder why there should be so much out-crying against that Band, seeing it hath so excellent a Design, the Glory of God, the Propagation of his Kingdom, Reformation of Religion, Extirpation of what is contrary to the Kingdom of Christ.

Min. Such Designs do usually beguile simple People, who think if the intention be good, all is right; but, Sir, you who are a Preacher, know that there are many more things required to make any one Action good, beside a right intention: We must not do evil that good may come of it; the intention of good will not justify the doing of evil. Some have, as they thought, designed the serving of

of God, when they were killing his Servants; but this did not justify their Murther.

Preach. What are these evils which are in that Band and Declaration?

Min. It would take a long time to relate them, let be to refute them: I have seen two Refutations of that Band. I shall give you some short Observations out of one of these Papers.

1. They have been very injurious to Presbyterians, in arrogating to themselves the Title of the *True Presbyterian Party*, seeing their Principles and Practices are contrary to the Principles of Presbyterians, which are published in their Confessions of Faith and Covenants: And they have in this very Bond, so clearly distinguished themselves from, and constitute themselves a Party Separate from the generality of the Presbyterians, that they who would gladly have fastened and Fathered this Band and Declaration upon Presbyterians, have given over that unreasonable attempt, for they saw that tale would not tell.

2. The whole contrivance looks like an Act of *Enthusiasm*, or of men desperate, rushing upon ruine and Death: They say, they are put to it by God, which looks like an *Enthusiastick* impulse. Some endeavoured to excuse them from *Enthusiasm*, by the words of the first Article, where they take the Scriptures to be the object of their Faith, and Rule of their Conversation; but when they

looked more narrowly to the words, and found that they say not the Word of God in the Scriptures, but his Scriptures and Word, they found that they had not sufficiently cleared themselves of *Enthusiasm*; for this seems to say, that there is a word distinct from the Scriptures, which they also take for the Object of their Faith, and Rule of their Conversation, some *Enthusiastick* expressions dropped in Sermons did increase the suspicion.

3. When they say, their Conscience and Men put them to it, how shall we know that it was not an erring Conscience; they must shew us by what Rule their Conscience was directed. And men are fallible both in making and breaking Covenants. *They like men*, saith the Lord, by the Prophet *Hosea*, *have transgressed the Covenant*. These men might have consulted with flesh and blood, and imagined that by getting others engaged in the same danger with themselves, they might be safer in a throng. Men are not to lippent to, except these Holy men of God who spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

4. They engage in the 2d. Art. *That they shall to the utmost of their Power, &c.* and so have altered a very necessary clause in the League and Covenant, viz. *We shall endeavour in our several Places and Callings*, Art. 1. *And in our several Vocations*, Art. 3. They saw that if they had kept within the bounds of their Callings, they could never have had access to make that terrible Confusion in Kirk and Kingdom which they designed:
Their

Their Places and Vocations did not allow or warrant them to overturn King and Kingdom, and bring all Ministers that were not of their way, to stand at their Bar. And therefore being resolved to pass the bounds of their Vocation, they left out these words of the Covenant, which manifestly crossed their Designs.

4. They say in that 2d. Art. *We shall to our Power, relieve the Church and Subjects of this Kingdom (we being called thereto by his giving of us Power, Power being Gods call to do good) of that oppression, &c.*

1. This is, I suppose, a new Principle in Christendom, that Power or Strength is Gods call. The *Turk* thinks he hath a Call and Right to take all that he hath might to Conquer; but this is a part of *Turcism*, which Christians detest. It's good that Malefactors who deserve Death, be Executed; but every man who hath strength or pith to kill them, is not called of God to put them to death. It's good that there be Magistrates to govern a City, it's good that the Gospel be Preached; but every man who hath ability to Govern a City, or to Preach, is not called of God to Govern or to Preach. If this Principle were reduced to practice, it would turn the World up-side down. It's good that a Master, who hath injured his Servant, should be punished: May therefore a Servant, if he be stronger than his Master, punish him? Is he called of God to do it? If ability to do good, were Gods call, the man who desired Christ to speak to his Brother, to divide the Inheritance with him, might have an-

swered to our Saviours Question, *Man, who made me a Judge or a Divider over you?* That seeing Christ had ability to judge and divide, that therefore he was called of God to judge and divide.

2. Seeing they had not power or strength to effectuate these great things, which they undertake in this and the following Articles; and seeing there was no probability, that a few private Persons could ever be in a capacity to do these things: And so seeing, according to their own description of Gods call; they neither had, nor ever were like to have Gods call to do these great things, how could they swear to do these things which they were not yet called to do, nor were ever like to be called to do them? To swear to do what we are not called to do, and which is not in our power, and is never like to be in our power, is a rash taking of the Name of God in vain; it's not a swearing in Judgment.

5. The Method they take to overturn Prelacy and *Eraastianism*, by overturning and ruining the Civil Government and Governours, is meer Confusion, and tends to havock and desolation. Presbyterians think themselves bound in their places and stations to seek the removal of Prelacy and *Eraastianism*, but they do not think it their Duty to overturn Civil Government to erect Presbyterial Government; to destroy Civil Order in the Kingdom, to erect Ecclesiastical Order in the Kirk: They do not think it their Duty to break the third Article of the Covenant, to keep the preceding Articles. As God hath appointed Order in the Church,

so he hath appointed Order in the State, and the one of these should not be overturned to establish the other. It's the earnest desire of Presbyterians, that the removal of all disorders in the Church, and the reparation of the Ruines of the Church may be by the hand of their rightful Rulers.

6. What confidence can the Subjects have, that they who have so easily shaken themselves loose of subjection to Lawful Rulers, to whom God hath commanded them to be subject for Conscience-sake, will be very tender of the Consciences of others, and will not exercise oppression upon the Consciences of these who would be under them? No great tenderneſs can rationally be expected from these, who have so lightly loosed themselves from the Obligation of the 3^d. Article of the Covenant. Or what confidence can they have, that their Banders will not dispossess them of their Civil Rights, if they find any fault in them, seeing they engage themselves to dispossess the King and Subordinate Magistrates of their places, to which they have undoubted right? Or that they who make not Conscience to attempt the greatest disturbance that can be imagined in the whole Kingdom, will regard the quiet or disturbance of private Persons?

Again, the Subjects do not desire to be relieved in the way laid down in this Bond, which is indeed the way of Disorder, Confusion, and Desolation; they think the Remedy would prove worse than the Disease. And what Right can be expected from these who makes Power and might to be a Call and Warrant for their Actings.

7. It may seem strange, that they could in the 3^d. Article mention the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant, without terrour and shame. Seeing they have so manifestly in many things departed from these Covenants, and gone cross to them, in this very Bond; for although in words they engage to extirpate Popery, in all the Articles of it, yet they really and effectually plant and establish several Popish Articles. It's a Popish Article, that the Ministers of the Reformed Churches should not be owned as Ministers, that Communion should not be kept with them, nor with these who joyn with them, in the publick Worship of God: The Authors of this Bond say the same of all the Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, who are not of their own Opinion and way; and, for any thing known, when this Bond came forth, these whom they own for Ministers, were but two or three at most, and they renounce Communion in the Worship of God, with all who joyn not with them in their wild and furious conceits. And thus they yield this to Papists, that there are no Ministers nor Churches in *Scotland* with which Christians should joyn in Christian or Church-fellowship. It's a Popish Article, that the Pope may depose Kings and Magistrates, and free Subjects of their Allegiance to Kings and Rulers, and that any private Person may kill these Rulers whom the Pope hath Excommunicated and Deposed.

The Authors of this Bond in their Deposing the King and Subordinate Rulers, and in declaring them no Rulers, and in engaging to execute Judgment upon them. (I shall forbear to speak of their

their late Excommunication of them, because I have not seen it) they have confirmed the Papists in these Errors, for they will think that the Pope may claim as much Power over Kings to whom he is not Subject as their own private Subjects claim.

Again, it's one of the Popes pranks to interdict Countries, or Cities, that he hath a quarrel at, in discharging all publick Worship of God in them; these Banders have done the same upon the matter, in going about to hinder, as far as their Power reaches, all publick Worship of God, except in these parts where their Preachers come.

We are by Covenant obliged to extirpate Schism; this Bond engages these who take it in one of the vilest Schisms that hath been heard of in the Church, as appears Article 6.

The Covenant is for the extirpation of Prelacy; but these Banders, though in words they engage to do so, yet they really make these Ministers of theirs, who are far from the number of fourteen, in effect Prelates, and will have all the Ministers of the Church to stand in Judgment before these Judges, and to be no Ministers, except these Ministers of theirs will.

And thus they really overturn Presbyterial Government, which the Covenant obliges to preserve. The Covenant obliges to preserve the Priviledges of Parliament, Liberties of the Kingdoms, and the Kings Majesties Person and Authority. This Bond

Bond engageth to destroy the King and his Authority, and to alter the very form of Government; so that if it should take effect, there would be no King, nor Parliament, nor Kingdom in the Nation.

And contrary to the 4th. Article of the Covenant, they make Factions among the People, and go about to divide the King from the People, by a most destructive Division in destroying the King.

The Covenant keeps every man in his own place and Calling, but all who take this Band, bind themselves in this 3^d. Article, to execute Righteous Judgment impartially according to the Word of God, and degree of wickedness upon the committers of Blasphemy, &c. So that all who take this Band, Ministers and People, Man and Woman, engage themselves to Act the part of Judges, in executing Righteous Judgment. But who made them Judges? They should have staid till they had gotten a call to Judge, and had been in a capacity of Judging, before they had sworn to execute Righteous Judgment.

Again, if all of them had been Judges, executing Righteous Judgment, then all would have been Rulers, and so there would have been none of them to be Ruled and Judged; and thus not onely their Ministers, but also all their Men old and young, and their Women, are engaged to pass the bounds of their Calling, and to perform that which would have been impractical and impossible.

Preacher. *But, Sir, are not the Saints to have a sharp Sword in their hand, to execute vengeance upon the Heathen, and punishment upon the People; to bind their Kings with Chains, and their Nobles with Fetters of Iron? To execute upon them the Judgment written, Psal. 149. 6, 7, 8, 9. And is it not promised to him that overcometh, and keepeth the words of Christ unto the end, that Christ will give him Power over the Nations, and that he shall Rule them with a Rod of Iron? Rev. 2. 26, 27.*

Minist. You might have learned from the Orthodox Interpreters of the Scripture, that the sword there, is not a Carnal Sword, but the sharp two-edged Sword of the Word of God, which binds and looses Persons of all Ranks, according as they Repent, or are obstinate, and contains in it the Sentence of God, which will be in due time executed; it's by the Word, by Spiritual Weapons that the Saints overcome the World, the Flesh, and the Devil.

And for that place in the 2^d. of *Rev.* Mr. *Durham* sheweth, that it is no Earthly Dominion which is there meant; for,

1. It's to be performed after the full Victory.
2. All overcomers are not capable of Temporal Power over the Nations. It imports then these two.

1. An excellent Dominion that the Believer may expect.

2. A

2. A joynt sharing in Christs Conquest over the Nation, 1 Cor. 6. *They shall judge Angels and all the Wicked in the day of Judgment* — Though often Believers are now oppressed by the Wicked of the World, yet the day is coming, when it shall be otherways; Believers shall not onely be free from their oppressions, but shall be as absolute Kings, *having Dominion over them in the morning*, as it is in the 49 *Psalms* 14. When the condition of the Wicked in Gods Justice shall be most miserable.

I have heard of late, that some of the People are so far deluded, as to imagine, that the place of Scripture which ye first mentioned, warrants every private Saint to take the Sword and execute Judgment upon all evil doers. But ye may easily perceive, that this is contrary to the Analogy of Faith, and the Confessions of Faith of all the Reformed Churches, and is the dregs of that Dream, that the Saints shall have a Temporal, Earthly Monarchy; and we who profess our selves to be Teachers of the People, should be so far from pleasing People in such Delusions, that we should faithfully discover their Errors unto them, and reprove them sharply, and not suffer sin to be upon their Souls, and especially Errors of this nature, that tends to the Ruine of all Humane Societies, and to utter Confusion and Desolation: And you will have little Peace if you see them by their practising these Erroneous Principles brought unto bonds, and under the lash of the Civil Sword.

Precach. Proceed in your Observations.

Min. 8. The

Min. 8. The formers of this Bond seem to have been unacquainted with the judgment of Presbyterians concerning the National Covenant; for in this Band they speak, as if Prelacy were not excluded by the National Covenant, but onely by the League and Covenant. They who engrossed to themselves the Title of the true Presbyterian Party, should not have been so ignorant of the sentiments of Presbyterians.

9. They who take this Band and adhere to it, cannot subscribe the Covenants: And I heard of one of this way, who said, if the subscribing of the Covenant were to do again, his hand should rather be cut off, than subscribe it: This shews, that this Band is inconsistent with these Covenants.

10. In the 4th. Article there are many horrid things vented of the Magistrates; as for Example, *That their Government cannot be called a Government, but a lustful rage, and that they can be no more called Governours, but Publick Grassators, that is, High-way Robbers, and publick Judgments, as Sword, Famine, Pestilence raging among us; and for a Conclusion, they say, that none can judge us bound in Allegiance to them, unless they say also, we are bound in Allegiance to the Devil, they being his Vicegerents, and not Gods.* If this be not an instance of speaking evil of Dignities, and of railing accusation against them, it will be hard to find an instance of such railing elsewhere.

11. It's very strange, that they say, that it cannot be thought that there is hope of the Magistrates Repentance. Was it not enough to them to exaggerate the Magistrates sins beyond the bounds of Truth and Soberness? But they must also magnifie and multiply them above the multitude of the great Mercies of God. Who can limit the Sovereign grace of God, *who bath Mercy on whom he will have Mercy?* The example of *Manasseh's* Repentance might have restrained them from this bold encroaching upon the Sovereignty of Free Grace.

12. It's a terrible stretch that they say they have shewed their enmities against all Righteousness; this is a part of the Description of *Elimas* the Sorcerer, *Acts* 13. 10. They cannot but be exceedingly blinded with prejudice against the Magistrate, who sees not some Righteousness in the exercise of their Government.

13. If Private Persons may take upon them, because of the sins of their Superiours, to disown their Authority, and take Power to themselves, and execute Judgment upon these who are their Parents, Masters, Magistrates; this would overturn the Foundations of all Humane Society, and fill the World with Confusion.

Though *Saul* was an ungodly man, and Persecuted *David* without a cause, and drove him out of the Land, from the Ordinances, and exposed him to the hazard of serving other gods: Though he unjustly and very summarily slew eighty five Priests of the Lord, and contrary to the manner of
the

the Kingdom, which obliged him to maintain Religion and Righteousness, did put the Foundations of the Earth out of course, yet *David* did not think himself obliged to disown *Saul* to be King, nor did he think himself obliged to kill *Saul* when he had Power and Opportunity to do it; he will not suffer his Men to do it, 1 *Sam.* 24. 6, 7. 1 *Sam.* 26. 8, 9. He did not think that his killing of *Saul* was the way to free the Land from Guiltiness; yea, his heart smote him for cutting off the lap of his Garment. He judged *Abner* worthy of Death, because he had not been careful to preserve *Saul's* Life: And though *David* was appointed of God to be a blessed Instrument of Reformation, and *Saul* stood in his way, yet he will not destroy him, but waits Gods leisure.

There were many ill Kings in *Judah*, but the Lord never directs private Persons to disown them, and dethrone and kill them.

Abaz is frequently called by the Lord, King *Abaz*, notwithstanding of all the ill he had done, and was doing.

Daniel calls *Darius* King, after the Blasphemous Decree which he had Signed.

Christ directs to give Tribute to *Cæsar*, and gives it himself: And *Paul* owns *Nero's* Judgment-seat, and Appeals to *Cæsar*; and what Monsters *Tiberius* and *Nero* were, is known to all who know the Histories of the *Roman* Emperours.

If this Device of nullifying the Authority of Rulers, because of their faults real or alledged, were put in practice, it would quickly turn the World upside-down. For though Magistrates, as Gods

Vicegerents, be singularly obliged to represent the Holiness and Righteousness of God in the exercise of their Government; yet if we consider that they have the same Corruption by nature which others have, and that they have greater temptations than others; and that there are often with them, men who for their own ends will tempt them to sins, which they would never have thought upon: As for Example, That abominable Decree which *Daniel's* Enemies cheatingly obtruded upon *Darius*, as a great Complement; and when they have gotten them to Enact any thing that is not right, they will alledge they are in point of Honour bound to maintain their own deed: And seeing there are many Flatterers, who will praise all that great Persons do, as if it were right: And seeing faithful Counsellors, who singly design the Glory of God, and the true Happiness and Interest of Rulers, are very rare:

*Dum non vult alter, timet alter dicere verum,
Regibus.*

And considering how many provocations Rulers use to get by bitter invectives and scurrilous Pamphlets, which tend to render them contemptible; and by slighting and misconstruing their favours, and by affronting of their Authority.

These things being considered, I mean, their inward Corruption and allurements to sin upon the one hand, and irritating Provocations upon the other hand, it's like enough that they who will nullifie their Authority, because of their faults, will

not want pretences; and they who are of this humour of Deposing Rulers, if they find not faults enough, they will make where they want; or they will magnifie their faults, and make them worse than they are. If Men of this disposition made Insurrection against *Moses*, and alledged upon him who was the meekest man upon Earth, and whom God had extraordinarily raised up, *That he lifted up himself above the Congregation of the Lord, and that he had brought them out of a Land flowing with Milk and Honey, to kill them in the Wilderness, and made himself altogether a Prince over them, and had not brought them unto a Land flowing with Milk and Honey, nor given them Inheritance of Fields and Vineyards: And that he would put out, or bore out their Eyes.* If they found, or made so many pretences against *Moses*, who was so blameless, O! how many faults would they find in the Persons and Government of the generality of Rulers, through the World in these last times, in which Iniquity does so much abound in Persons of all ranks?

Preach. But if Kings and Rulers do not what they ought to do, but do the contrary, then the Subjects are free from any Oath of Allegiance, and from any Covenant made to preserve their Persons and Authority.

In the National Covenant we swear to defend the Kings Person and Authority with our Goods, Bodies, and Lives, in the defence of Christ, his Evangel, Liberties of the Countrey, Ministration of Justice, and Punishment of Iniquity, against all Enemies

within this Realm and without, as we desire our God to be a strong and merciful defender to us, in the day of our Death, and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And in the Solemn League and Covenant we swear to preserve and defend the Kings Majesties Person and Authority, in the Preservation and defence of the true Religion and Liberties of the Kingdoms. And thus our Promise to preserve and defend his Person and Authority is restricted; and when he does not what is his part, we are not bound to own or defend him and his Authority: As when two agrees that the one shall pay so much money upon the others delivering so much Corn or Meal; if the Victual be not delivered by the one, the other is under no Obligation to pay the Money.

Min. That comparison may beguile simple People, but it's strange that any Preacher should be deceived with it; for this is clear, that there is no other ground upon which the one is obliged to pay the Money, but the delivering of the Victual by the other, according to their agreement: But all Inferiours, Servants, Children, Subjects, are bound by the Law of God and Nations to honour their Superiours, Masters, Parents, Magistrates, although their Superiours be undutiful, as appears from 1 Pet. 2. 18, 19, 20. *Servants be Subject to your Masters with all fear, not only to the good, but to the froward, or perverse, as it's also rendered.* This Scripture is cited in the larger Catechism, in explication of the fifth Commandment,

to shew what is the Honour that Inferiours owe to Superiours.

If the miscarriages of Magistrates, Masters, Parents, or the miscarriages of Inferiours, did dissolve the Relation, and make it void: And if the miscarriages of Married Persons did nullifie the Marriage-relation, and loose the Party wronged from all Obligation towards the Party that's injurious, this would quickly dissolve the Bonds of all Humane Society, and make Men like a multitude of loose Cartel.

If Subjects were not bound to give due Obedience to Magistrates, except they did preserve the true Religion, then all the Directions that Christ and his Apostles gave to Honour, and be Subject to, and pay Tribute to, and pray for the Magistrates and Powers that then were, did not oblige the People to whom they were first directed; for all the Magistrates then were Infidels and Idolaters.

In the Confession of Faith, *Chap. 23. Art. 4.* It's the Duty of People to pray for Magistrates, to Honour their Persons, to pay them Tribute, and other dues, to obey their Lawful Commands, and to be Subject to their Authority for Conscience sake. Infidelity or difference of Religion, doth not make void the Magistrates just and Legal Authority, nor free the People from their due obedience to him.

And the General Assembly, *Anno 1639.* in their Supplication to the Committioner and Council, say, *We have Solemnly sworn, and do swear, not only our mutual Concurrence and Assistance for the cause*

of Religion; and to the utmost of our Power, with our Means and Lives, to stand to the Defence of our dread Sovereign, his Person and Authority, in the Preservation of true Religion, Liberties, and Laws of this Kirk and Kingdom; but also in every Cause which may concern His Majesties Honour, shall concur with our Friends and followers, as we shall be required.

Preach. Subjects are not obliged to concur with, and assist Rulers in doing ill.

Min. That's true; for to concur with them, in assisting them to do evil, were to partake of their sin: But though we may not partake of their evil, yet that will not follow, that we must not maintain their Person and Authority. Although the *Israelites* would not assist and concur with *Saul* in destroying *Jonathan*, but rescued him, yet they thought themselves bound to defend *Saul's* Person and Authority. It's one thing not to concur with Superiours in evil, and another thing to destroy their Persons and their Power, because they do evil.

But ye cannot deny, but the Covenant obliges to defend and maintain the King in so far as he maintains the true Religion and Righteousness; and I think ye will not deny that the King doth in part maintain the true Religion and Righteousness, and therefore ye are bound to defend his Person and Authority; and how can ye defend his Person and Authority in doing any good, if ye destroy his Person and Power, as is designed and sworn in this Band.

There

There are many other Absurdities in that fourth Article of the Band, which were tedious to repeat and refute.

In the fifth Article they say, *We then being made free by God and their own doings, he giving the Law, and they giving the transgression of that Law, which is the cause that we are loosed from all Obligations Divine and Civil to them.*

It's strange that men who cry out against these who break other Articles of the Covenant, should so boldly shake off the Obligation of the third Article of the Covenant, and so increase the sin of the Nation by adding the breach of the Civil part of the Covenant to the breach of the Religious part of it.

To make out what they assert, it's not enough to prove that the Rulers have transgressed the Law of God, for they must also shew from the Law, that it is the will of God, that Subjects should upon such and such transgressions, shake off all Obligations towards such Rulers: But this they have never attempted, because they could not. I would enquire at them, doth every transgression loose these Obligations? If not, then how many, and how great must these transgressions be? And then shall a few private Persons, who have very little Interest in the Nation, determine this Question, How many, and how great transgressions makes Rulers no Rulers, and Subjects no Subjects?

Then they promise to set up Government and Governours according to the Word of God, especially

cially *Exod. 18. 21.* Moreover, thou shalt provide out of all the People able Men, such as fear God, Men of Truth, hating Covetousness, &c. I wish they had pondered *Prov. 24. 21, 22.* My Son, fear thou the Lord and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change: For their Calamity shall rise suddenly, and who knoweth the ruine of them both?

The Dutch Interpreters expound it of these who are addicted to changes and novelties, departing from the Obedience which they owe to God and their Lawful Magistrates, and rising up in Rebellion against them.

Moses was King in *Jesurun*, and his setting up subordinate Rulers, is no pattern for their shaking off the Yoke of Subjection, and setting up Usurpers and an unlawful Government: The 16 of *Numbers*, where Subjects do Seditiously exalt themselves against *Moses* and *Aaron*, quadrats better with their case than the 18 of *Exodus*, where *Moses* makes subordinate Rulers for his own and the Peoples ease. And how could they in Reason expect, that able men, wise and prudent men, fit for Government, or men fearing God, or men of Truth, would undertake to be Governours over them? For wise men would see the sin, and snare, and hazard in breaking down the hedge of Civil or Ecclesiastical Government, *Eccles. 10. 8.* Men fearing God they also fear the King, and fear an Oath; and men of Truth will not deal falsely in the matter of their Covenant with God or Man: And who but foolish rash Persons would take upon them

them to Rule such an unruly and disorderly People, who had destroyed all Order Civil and Ecclesiastical?

It's strange that they durst speak, as they do, of Kingly Government and Lineal Succession, seeing the Lord established both among his People in the House of *David*, the man after his own heart.

○ Kingly Government, as established in these Nations, in which King and Parliament make Laws, is a form of Government so excellent, that few, except Persons byassed with prejudice, will find fault with it: The faults of Rulers should not be imputed to the form of Government.

They engage to set up the Judicial Law, but they apprehend it would not reach far enough, and they reject some parts of it; but beside these things which they mention, there are several other things, which would not suit with us: Some, even of their Capital Laws, have intimate connexion with their Ceremonial Law, and derive much of their strength and equity from it: By that Law Fornication in the Priests Daughter was Capital, and so was the gathering of sticks upon the Sabbath-day; and this seems to be a lesser breach of the Sabbath than the mispending of a great part of the Lords day in drawing up Men and Horse, and learning them how to handle their Arms; as if the Lords day had been a day of Rendezvouz, or Weapon-shewing. The restoring of four or five-fold would not sufficiently restrain Theft in this Nation.

The

The Judicial Law was not given to other Nations. See *Confes. of Faith*, Chap. 19. Art. 4. To them also as a Body Politick, he gave sundry Judicial Laws, which expired together with the Estate of that People, nor obliging any other now further than the general equity thereof may require.

Our Saviour and the Apostles never offered to impose the Judicial Law upon the *Gentiles*: The Apostle *Paul* submitted to be judged by the *Roman Law* at *Cæsar's* Judgment-Seat, and exhorts Christians of all Nations to submit themselves to the Government and wholesom Laws of the Nations, in which they lived. There have been Hereticks, who were for restoring of the Judicial and Ceremonial Law; and some wild Persons in the *Netherlands* have, of late, written for this Error; and there is the more need to take heed of restoring the Judicial Law, because of its connexion with the Ceremonial Law. This is a strange Age, some are seeking to draw the World by *Pelagianism* and *Quakerism* to old *Paganism*; and some seeking to draw men under the shadow and vail of *Judaism*.

They are not very much concerned, though they be called *Fifth-Monarchy-men*. But this contrivance of theirs is so strange, that it is hard to find a name for it; it's rather an Anarchy and Confusion than a Government: And it's hoped that it will never have any such proportion to the four Monar-

Monarchies, as to get the name of a Fifth-Monarchy: And it is fit that such a Monstrous thing die ere it get a Name. I know nothing so like to it, as the Insurrection of the Boors in *Germany*, who believed *Thomas Munster* and *Nicholas Stork*, that God was setting up a new Kingdom, in which the Saints should Reign, and that the present wicked Magistrates were to be killed, and Godly Magistrates set up in their stead: These Teachers pretended Revelations and Christian Liberty.

The poor People believed these delusions, and rejected the wholesom Instructions of *Lutber* and *Melancthon*; and in their Fury, which they imagined to be true Zeal, they would needs fight, but when it came to fighting, they could neither fight nor flee; and in one Summer fifty thousand of them were killed. *Munster* at his Death confessed his Error, and exhorted the Princes to use more clemency towards poor Men, and so they needed not fear any such hazard; and withal exhorted them to read diligently the Book of the Kings.

If they who contrived this Bond of Confusion, had considered the Confession of Faith, and the Questions in the larger Catechism, which explain the fifth Commandment, and the Scriptures confirming the Articles of the 23^d. Chapter of the Confession, and the Answers of the fore-said Questions, it might have prevented this furious and mad design, *Confes. Chap. 23. Art. 1.* God the Supream Lord and King of all the World, hath ordained

ordained Civil Magistrates, &c. *Rom. 13. 1, 2, 3.* Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers, for there is no Power but of God; the Powers that be, are ordained of God: Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation, &c. *1 Pet. 2. 13, 14.* Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords sake, whether it be to the King as Supream, &c.

And *Art. 4.* It's the Duty of People to pray for Magistrates, to Honour their Persons, to pay them Tribute, and other dues, to Obey their Lawful Commands, and to be Subject to their Authority, for Conscience sake.

Infidelity or difference of Religion doth not make void the Magistrates Just and Legal Authority, nor free the People from their due Obedience to him, from which Ecclesiastical Persons are not exempted; much less hath the Pope any Power or Jurisdiction over them in their Dominions, or over any of their People; and least of all, to deprive them of their Dominions or Lives, if he shall judge them to be Hereticks, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.

1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. I exhort therefore that first of all, Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made for all Men, for Kings, and for all that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godliness and Honesty.

1 Pet. 2. 17. Rom. 13. 6, 7. For this cause pay you Tribute also, &c. *Titus 3. 1.* Put them in mind to be Subject to Principalities and Powers, to Obey Magistrates.

Magistrates. 1 Pet. 2. 13, 14. & 16. *As free, and not using your Liberty as a Cloak of maliciousness, but as the Servants of God.* 1 Kings 2. 35. Acts 25. 9, 10. *Then said Paul, I stand at Cæsar's Judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged—— I Appeal unto Cæsar.* 2 Pet. 2. 1. 10, 11. *But there were false Prophets also among the People, even as there shall be false Teachers among you—— But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of Uncleanneſs, and deſpiſe Government; preſumptuous are they, ſelf-willed, they are not afraid to ſpeak evil of Dignities; whereas Angels, who are greater in Power and might, bring no railing accusation againſt them before God.* Jude 8, 9, 10, 11. *Like- wiſe alſo theſe filthy Dreamers deſile the Fleſh, deſpiſe Dominion, and ſpeak evil of Dignities. Yet Michael the Arch-Angel, when contending with the Devil about the Body of Moſes, durſt not bring againſt him a railing accusation, but ſaid, the Lord rebuke thee: But theſe ſpeak evil of theſe things which they know not, but what they know naturally, as brute Beaſts in theſe things they corrupt themſelves: Woe unto them, for they have gone in the way of Cain, and run greedily after the Error of Balaam, and periſhed in the gain-ſaying of Core.* 2 Theſ. 2. 4. Rev. 13. 15, 16, 17. *In the larger Catechiſm.*

Queſt. Who are meant by Father and Mother in the fifth Commaundment?

*Anſw. By Father and Mother in the fifth Com-
mand-*

mandment are meant not only Natural Parents, but all Superiours in Age and Gifts, and especially such as by Gods Ordinance are over us in place of Authority, whether in Family, Church, or Common-wealth; and they cite *Isa. 49. 23. And Kings shall be thy Nursing-Fathers, and Queens thy Nursing-Mothers.*

Quest. Why are Superiours stiled Father and Mother?

Ans. Superiours are stiled Father and Mother, both to teach them in all Duties towards their Inferiours, like Natural Parents, to express love and tendernefs to them, according to their severall Relations; and to work Inferiours to a greater willingness and chearfulness in performing their Duties towards their Superiours.

Quest. What is the Honour that Inferiours owe to Superiours?

Ans. The Honour which Inferiours owe to Superiours, is, all due Reverence in Heart, Word, and Behaviour, Prayer and Thanksgiving for them, imitating their Virtues and Graces, willing Obedience to their Lawful Commands and Counsels, due Submission to their Corrections, Fidelity to defence and maintenance of their Persons and Authority, according to their severall Ranks, and Nature of their places, bearing with their Infirmities, and covering them in love, that so they may

may be an Honour to them, and to their Government.

And for confirming this Answer, beside places cited in the Confession, they cite Ephes. 6. 5, 6, 7. 1 Pet. 2. 18, 19, 20. *Servants be Subject to your Masters with all fear, not only to the good, but to the froward; for this is thank-worthy, if a Man for Conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully; for what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.* Titus 2. 9, 10. 1 Sam. 26. 15, 16. — *Wherefore hast thou not kept thy Lord the King — This thing is not good which thou hast done; as the Lord liveth, ye are worthy to die, because ye have not kept your Master the Lords anointed.* 2 Sam. 18. 3. — *But now thou art worth ten thousand of us.* Esther 6. 2. Matth. 22. 21. — *Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are Gods.* Rom. 13. 6, 7. Gen. 9. 23. *And Shem and Japhet took a Garment, and laid it upon their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their Father, and their faces were backward, and they saw not their Fathers nakedness.*

If we compare this Band with the Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, and the Covenants, and the Scriptures which are cited in the Confession of Faith, and larger Catechism, we may see, if we will

will not shut our eyes, that this Band cannot be reconciled with these, but manifestly clasheth with them; and therefore they who adhere to this Band, are a party who by their tenets and practices, distinguish themselves from these, who do adhere to the Confession of Faith, Catechisms, and Covenants.

I had forgot that they also design themselves Persons whom the Magistrate hath declared no Lawful Subjects, which shews, that their number is not great, and yet there are many who fall under the lash of these Declarations, who think themselves bound by the Covenants to maintain the Kings Person and Authority; and who disclaimed *Ruglen* Declaration, and would undergo a thousand Deaths, ere they subscribed this Band: And it's hoped that the Magistrates will think it true Policy to put a difference betwixt these who own their Authority, and these who disown it.

This shews how inconsiderable the number of these who own this Band are, and how unfit they are to make a Representative of the true Presbyterian Church and Covenanted Nation of *Scotland*.

Very

Very ordinarily they who are for destroying Magistrates, are no great friends to Ministers: Having rejected the Magistrates in the preceding Articles, they fall upon the Ministers in the sixth Article, at least the greater part of them, as being defective in preaching and testifying against the Acts of the Rulers, &c. and then for hindring others who were willing to have testified, &c. It was a long time a mystery to many what some people meant by a testimony, which they were always calling for; because although Ministers plainly preached as their Text led them, against Prelacy and Erastianism: and did shew the people from the Scripture, that God hath given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to Ministers, and not to Magistrates; and that the things of the House of God, Ecclesiastical matters, must be done according to the will of the God of Heaven, and not according to the will of the Magistrate. And though they with grief regrated the breaches made in the Order and Government of the Church, yet these people would still exclaim against them, as not bearing testimony against the ills of the time: but at length it appeared what was the testimony which they meant: for if one instead of preaching the Gospel, had made an invective discourse against the Rulers, and treated them at the rate that they are treated in this band, and so rendred them and their Authority despicable and hateful; O! that was a preaching of the whole counsel of God, though they brought neither Scripture nor Reason for what they said, and

they made nothing of what was brought from Scripture and Reason against *Prelacy* and *Era-stianism*, by other Ministers, because they also did preach the duty which subjects owed to the Magistrate, and maintained their lawful Authority, as Gods Ordinance; and prayed for the King and subordinate Magistrates.

The Testimony which some of these people, who were upon the secret which hath now broken out, were seeking, was something which might render the Magistrate hateful, and cast him out of the affections of the subjects, and so make way for driving on the design which is now discovered in this band and declaration, *viz.* the rejection of the King and Kingly Government, and all subordinate Magistrates deriving their Authority from the King.

They are highly injurious to *Presbyterian* Ministers, in alledging that they have not born testimony to that truth which Christ witnessed before *Pontius Pilate*, *viz.* That Christ is a King: for they declare it privately and publicly in their places and stations, That Christ is a King, and that he hath a spiritual Kingdom distinct from the Kingdoms of this world, but no ways prejudicial to earthly Kingdoms; but where it comes into any Kingdom of this world, it is, if it be received, the establishment of that Kingdom.

Not to repeat what is said in several Papers, which do shew the several sorts of testimonies both verbal and real, given by *Presbyterian* Ministers, I shall only say, That their testimony concern-

concerning the Church and the Government thereof, and the power of the Magistrate in reference to Church-matters, is in the Confession of their Faith and Catechisms, Directory for Worship and Government ; and as it could hardly be expected that these Ministers, being so scattered, could meet to agree upon new Confessions ; so though they had met, they could not readily have fallen upon a better confession than what is already extant, and to which they add here.

In chap. 25. of the *Confession of Faith*, Art. 2. it is asserted, *That the visible Church is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the House and Family of God*—Art. 3. *Unto this Catholick visible Church Christ hath given the Ministry, Oracles and Ordinances of God, for gathering and perfecting of the Saints.* Art. 6. *There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ.* Chap 30. *The Lord Jesus as King and Head of his Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church-Officers, distinct from the Civil Magistrate.* Art. 2. *To these Officers the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed*—Chap. 31. Art. 3. *It belongs to Synods and Councils ministerially to determine controversies of Faith, and cases of Conscience ; to set down Rules and Directions for the better ordering of the publick Worship of God, and government of his Church.* Art. 5. *Syneds and Councils are to conclude nothing but that which is Ecclesiastical, and are not to meddle with Civil affairs ; which concern the Commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition, in cases extraordinary ; or*

by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereto required by the Civil Magistrate. Chap. 23. Art. 3. The Civil Magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of word and Sacraments, as the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and intire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship or discipline prevented or reformed, and all Ordinances of God duly settled, administred, and observed, for the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them, be according to the word of God.

These Articles, and the Scripture-proofs, do clearly hold out, and confirm, That Christ, not the Magistrate, is the Head, King, Lord of the Church, which is the Body, House, and Kingdom of Christ; that Church, and not the Magistrate, is the Fountain of the Spiritual Power of the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; that the Offices in the Church are of divine institution, given by Christ; and that these Offices which Christ hath given, are sufficient for gathering and perfecting the Church, seeing he hath given them for that end, and that they are Ministerial, and not Lordly; and hence it follows, that the Office of a Prelate (who claims a majority of Directive and Coercive power over Ministers, who not only takes upon him, without election, to moderate Synods, but also

is

is above the censure of the Synod, and who can hinder the Synod from concluding any thing, how necessary soever they find it, and without whose Authority the Synod is no Synod ; who imposes Moderators upon the meetings for exercise, and to whom these meetings are countable for their actings, without whom there can be no ordination, deposition, excommunication, relaxation from it, who exacteth an Oath of Canonical obedience from Ministers) not being in the Rolls of the Offices and Officers given by Christ ; and being a Lordly, and so more than a Ministerial Office , *Presbyterians* cannot own it, nor judg it useful for gathering or perfecting of the Church. They shew also, that the Magistrate to whom God hath given the Lordly power of the sword, is so far from having a spiritual Supreme power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that he hath not the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven given to him at all ; for the power of the keys which Christ hath given, is Ministerial, and makes those who are invested with it, Ministers of the Church ; but the power of the Sword is Magistratical, and a Lordly Dominion ; and that it belongs to Synods and Councils , and not to *Magistrates*, to make Ecclesiastical Rules, &c. and that none, neither *Magistrates* nor *Ministers*, may order Ecclesiastical matters according to their mind and pleasure ; but those things must be ordered according to the mind and will of God revealed in his word.

And all true *Presbyterians* believe, That seeing both the Lordly Power of the *Magistrate* in general, and in special the Kingly Power, and the *Ministerial Power* of *Church-Officers* are of God, and his Ordinances, that they are not contrary to one another; for the Ordinances of God do not juttle one against another, but sweetly agree; and any justling or clashing which hath proceeded from the corruptions of *Magistrates* or *Ministers*, are not to be imputed to the Lords Ordinances; and it's the earnest desire of all truly godly and loyal subjects, who seek the glory of God, and the *Magistrates* true honour and interest, That whatsoever in the actings of their rightful *Magistrates* hath exceeded the bounds which the Lord hath set to them, may be in mercy discovered to them, and in time reformed. That all occasions of grief and stumbling may be taken out of the way of truly loyal subjects; and all occasion of doing mischief may be cut off from those who take advantage from those excesses to render the *Magistrate* contemptible, and to overthrow that Power which they have from God.

As for what they say of *Ministers* hindering those who would have given a testimony, and censuring others who did give it; the truth is, *Presbyterian Ministers* endeavoured to restrain some young men, who instead of preaching the Gospel, made it their work to revile the *Magistrate*, and *Ministers*, who made use of the liberty granted by the *Magistrate*; but these youths discovered themselves not to be of
Pres-

Presbyterian Principles, by their refusing to be subordinate to the *Ministers*, and by reproaching them who would have reclaimed them from their disorderly and Schismatick practices. By this the *Magistrate* may perceive if the *Presbyterian Ministers*, who are *Presbyterians* indeed, had by allowance of the *Magistrate*, the peaceable exercise of their *Ministry*, and liberty of meeting for regulating their own actings, and the actings of those who profess themselves to be *Presbyterians*, such unruly persons who stir up the people to Schism and Sedition, would not be admitted to the *Ministry*; or if they, after their admission, discovered themselves to be of pernicious principles, they would be put from the *Ministry*, and so the people who are true to *Presbyterian* Principles, would not own them, and so they would not have access to pervert the people with Seditious and Schismatick doctrine; this would be found the most proper Remedy for these distempers. But what wonder is it, if young men, who are ordinarily rash, being but Novices, who have not studied the Body of Divinity, and who have no experience, and know not the Principles and Practices of *Presbyterial* Government, who are not put to *Presbyterial* Exercises for their trial and instruction, and who it may be have never seen any thing of the Exercise of *Presbyterial* Government in *Presbyteries* or Synods, and who are not under the inspection of meetings of *Presbyterians*, but wander to and fro at random, not thinking themselves accountable to any meeting of *Ministers*,

nor censurable by any. What wonder is it, if such persons, when they are blown up with the vain applause of some ignorant and humorous people, who under their sad sufferings have taken up such prejudice against the *Magistrate*, and all to whom the *Magistrate* shews any favour, that they think what is most cross to the *Magistrate*, is most right; and any thing which the *Magistrate* allows, they think it wrong; and so they cry up those Preachers most who speak most invectively against the *Magistrate*, and against those *Ministers* to whom the *Magistrate* shews any favour. I say, what wonder is it if such youths, blown up with the wind of popular applause, fall into many snares, and take courses that tend to bring all things sacred and civil into confusion. They add, *For which, together with other causes, &c. we may say God hath left them to do worse things*— This is among their rash sayings; it was the duty of *Presbyterians* to censure such unruly youths. They add, *But also have voted in that meeting which they are pleased to call an Assembly of Ministers, but how justly, let men judge, an acceptance of that liberty founded upon, and given by virtue of that blasphemously arrogated and usurped power*— Their alledgance that that meeting is not to be called an Assembly of Ministers, will beget no prejudice against it in the minds of men who have any sound judgment in matters of that nature. And sober and judicious men would have suspected that meeting, if it had pleased their banners, or any of such principles as they maintain.

And

And none except ignorants, or persons blinded with prejudice, will say that the liberty of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, granted by the Magistrate, is founded upon any unlawful power, or supremacy. The Magistrates granting liberty of the peaceable exercise of the Ministry, is the exercise of that power which the Magistrate hath from God. That which the Magistrate ought to do, doth not flow from any unlawful power, but the Magistrate ought to grant to the Ministers of the Gospel liberty to exercise their Ministry peaceably; and therefore such a grant of liberty, &c. or such liberty granted, doth not flow from, nor is founded upon any unlawful or usurped power or supremacy. They add, *And hath appeared before their Courts to accept of that liberty, and to be Enacted and authorized there as Ministers, and so hath willingly (for this is an elicit act of the will, and not an act of force and constraint) translated the power of sending out, ordering, censuring; for as they accept of their liberty from them, so they submit to their censures and restraints, at least all of them who were yet tried with it; and others of them appeared and acknowledged before their Courts, that they would not have done these things that they were charged with, if they had thought it would have offended them. Ministers departing from the Court of Christ, and subjection to the Ministry to the Courts of men, and subjection to the Magistrate (which had been impious and injurious to Christ and his Church, though they had been righteous and lawful rulers; and by their changing*
of

of Courts according to common Law, hath changed their masters ; and of the Ministers of Christ are become the Ministers of men, and bound to answer to them as oft as they will ; and as by the acceptance of this liberty in such manner, they have translated the power, so they have given up and utterly quit the Government, and a succession of a Presbyterian Ministry ; for as these were not granted them of their masters, so they exercise their Ministry without them, and so by this as the Ecclesiastical Government is swallowed up in the Civil, if the rest had followed them, the Ministry should have also been extinct with themselves, and the whole work of Reformation had been buried in oblivion, not so much as the remembrance of it kept up. —

Ans. If the Magistrates will see these Ministers, for whom the people supplicate, why should they refuse to appear ? what solid reason can be given for such a refusal ? and what ill is there in the Councils recording in their Act, that upon such a day, such a Minister, for whom such a Parish had supplicated, was allowed to Preach in such a Parish ? That they appeared to be authorized as Ministers, if they mean, as it seems they do, that they appeared to receive their Ministerial authority from the Council, or that they appeared to be made Ministers of the Gospel, it is a manifest slander ; for as they had their Ministerial authority before their appearance before the Council, so the Council did not pretend to make them Ministers, but presupposed that they were Ministers, by enquiring where

where they were Ordained Ministers ; and the Council cannot well be blamed, to inform themselves concerning the persons whom they permit to Preach, that they may not allow they know not whom, but may be assured that they are Ministers, and that they are not seditious, turbulent persons. But if by authorizing, they mean the Magistrates Civil allowance, maintenance, protection ; it's the Magistrates duty thus to authorize those who are Ordained Ministers of the Gospel in the publick exercise of the Spiritual power and authority of their Office, as all Orthodox Anti-Eraſtian Divines grant.

And becauſe the Authors of this Band ſeem to have been unacquainted with the judgment of *Presbyterian* Divines in theſe matters, I ſhall for their information, and the information of others, who are bold to ſpeak of things which they do not underſtand, ſet down the judgment of *Presbyterian* Divines in this matter, as it is holden forth in that famous Book, *The Divine right of Church-Government*, Chap. 6. Pag. 55.

2. *The power or authority of Church-Government is a derived power : for clearing of this, note there is a Magiſterial, primitive, ſupreme power, which is peculiar to Jeſus Chriſt our Mediator, as hath been proved, Chap. 3. & 5 ; and there is a Miniſterial, derivative, ſubordinate power, which the Scripture declares to be in Church-guides, Mat. 16. 19. & 18. 18. Joh. 20, 21, 23. Mat. 28. 19, 20. 2 Cor. 10. 8. & 13. 10. and often elſewhere, this is abundantly teſtified ; but whence is this power originally derived to them ? here we are carefully*

to consider, and distinguish three things touching this power and authority from one another, viz.

1. The Donation of the authority it self, and of the Offices whereunto this power doth properly belong.
2. The designation of particular persons unto such Offices as are vested with such power.
3. The publick protection, countenancing, authorizing, defending, maintaining of such Officers in the publick exercise of such power, within such and such Realms and Dominions; this being premised, we may clearly thus resolve, according to Scripture-warrant, viz. the designation or setting apart of particular individual persons to those Offices in the Church, that have power and authority engraven upon them, is from the Church, nominating, electing and ordaining of such persons thereunto. See Act. 13. 1, 2, 3. 1 Tim. 4. 4. & 5. 22. Tit. 1. 5. Act. 4. 22.

The publick defence, maintenance, &c. of such Officers in the publick exercise of the power and authority of their Office, in such and such Dominions, is from the Civil Magistrate, as the nursing Father of the Church, Isa. 49. 23. For it is by his authority and sanction, that such publick places shall be set apart for publick Ministry, that such maintenance and reward shall be legally performed for such Ministry; that all such persons, of such and such Congregations, shall be (in case they neglect their duty to such Ministry) punished with such Political penalties, &c. But the donation of the Office and spiritual authority annexed thereunto, is only derived from Jesus Christ our Mediator, he alone gives all Church-Officers, and therefore none may devise or superadd any new Officers, Ephes. 4. 7, 8, 10, 11. 1 Cor.

1 Cor. 12. 28. *And he alone derives all authority and power Spiritual to these Officers, for dispensing the Word, Sacraments, Censures, and all Ordinances, Mat. 16. 19. & 28. 18, 19, 20. Joh. 20. 21, 22, 23. 2 Cor. 10. 8. & 13. 10. and therefore it is not safe for any creature to intrude upon this Prerogative Royal of Christ to give any power to any Officer of the Church.*

And thus we see that these Learned and Godly Ministers, who solidly in that same Book refute *Eraastianism*, yet assert that it belongs to the Magistrate to protect, countenance, authorize, defend, maintain Ministers in the publick exercise of their Ministry which they have received from the Lord Jesus. But it's the ignorance of the solid writings of *Presbyterians* which makes some folks so confident, that they are true *Presbyterians*, and adhering to *Presbyterian Principles*, when in the mean time they are publishing to the world, that they are strangers to the solid writings of sound *Presbyterians*. And there is no Orthodox Divine who would find fault with these Ministers, who when they appeared before the Council, did give humble thanks to the Kings Majesty, and the Lords of his Majesties Council, for the peaceable exercise of the Ministry which they had received from the Lord Jesus.

The elicit act of the Will is too Philosophical for common people to subscribe or swear to, for they can hardly be made to understand it. And what they say concerning it, is not Philosophical enough to be approved by those who under-

understand what an elicit act is ; for elicit acts of the Will are such as immediately flow from the Will, as love or hatred, volition, or nolition. Now translation of power from Ministers to Magistrates, is not made by these inward acts of the Will, but by some external imperate acts, as speaking, writing, &c. Politick acts of surrender, or translation of power, are not effectuate by meer elicit internal acts of the Will. But their ignorance of the nature of an elicit act of the *Will*, and their opposing acts of force and constraint to elicit acts ; whereas elicit acts use to be contra-distinguished from imperate acts ; and their insinuating, That if an act be not an elicit act of the *Will*, it is an act of force and constraint ; whereas the imperate acts of the *Will* are not elicit acts, and yet being commanded by the *Will*, they are not acts of force and constraint ; these are more harmless mistakes. But it is a very injurious calumny, that those Ministers who appeared before the Council translated the power of sending out, ordering and censuring Ministers to the Magistrate ; It's a ridiculous ignorant conceit to imagine, that what these Ministers did in appearing before the Council, was a translation of the power of order, of Potestative mission, or else such censuring to the Magistrate, or changing their Master, and making themselves the Ministers of men, and a quitting of the Government and succession of a *Presbyterian* Ministry.

These are meer calumnies, and ridiculous fopperies, that none who understand any thing

in these matters, will think worthy of any answer. They were very injurious to the poor people, many of whom are simple and ready through prejudice to believe any ill word spoken against indulged Ministers, who in their Papers and Pamphlets abused them with such slanders. But they are more injurious to them, who would have them to subscribe and swear such injurious calumnies, and ridiculous fopperies, which are not only far from truth, but from any appearance of truth. And so much hath been said in several Papers written in vindication of the practice of the Indulged Ministers, that it were to waste time and paper to answer any more to these Calumniators; and the best answer to them, is to pray, that the Lord would give them repentance for these abominable reproaches, whereby they have very actively driven on the design of Satan, and his instruments the *Papists* and *Quakers*, &c. which is to render the Ministry contemptible. And it was seen and told long ago, that they would not rest satisfied with the reproaching of a few Ministers, but would proceed to render all contemptible. The contrivers of this Devilish work of rendering Ministers contemptible and useless; for they have casten all, except some few, who for any thing known, did not exceed the number of four, and some think that they were but three at most, and one of them was casten by the other two.

It is strange that any person who had the use of reason, could be so far blinded with prejudice, as to think that these Ministers did translate the power of sending out Ministers, or the power of Potestative mission to the Magistrate; for, as was said, the Magistrate supposed them to be Ordained ministers, and so to have a Potestative mission to Preach the Gospel already; for ministers are potestatively sent to preach the Gospel, when they are Ordained ministers; & this clearly appeared by the Councils inquiring, if they were, and where, or by whom they were Ordained ministers; if the Council had called some persons who were not Ordained, and sent them to Preach and Baptize, &c. then they might have alledged that the Magistrate did assume the power of sending out ministers, or of a Potestative mission; but they never pretended to any thing like that.

Preacher. But, Sir, did not the Council send these ministers to these Congregations?

Minist. 1. The Council did not so much as use the word of sending.

2. Suppose they had used the word of sending, that would not have imported a Potestative mission, because the *Magistrate* did suppose that they were already Ordained. Ye heard also that Mr. *Welsh* in his Preface to King *Jarvis* desires the King to send ministers throughout the Land; it were great ignorance and perverseness to gather from that word, that he translated to the King the power of a Potestative mission.

3. Sup-

3. Suppose the Magistrate had said nothing concerning their being Ordained Ministers before, it had been great perverseness to have concluded from the Magistrates sending of them, that they ceased to be the Ministers of Christ, and became the Ministers of men. Will any be so perverse as to conclude, because *Jehoshaphat*, 2 Chron. 17. 8, 9. sent Priests and Levites through all the Cities of *Judah* to teach the people, that therefore these Priests and Levites ceased to be the Lords Ministers, and became the ministers of the King?

Preach. But *Jehoshaphet* was a godly reforming King?

Minist. That is nothing to the purpose in hand. Ye might have remembred that Mr. *Rutherford* shews that the magistratical power in reference to the Church, is the same in *Nero*, and in a Christian magistrate; and if a godly King's sending ministers, does not annul their ministry, then no magistrate's sending ministers to preach, &c. doth make them no ministers of Christ.

Did *Ezra* cease to be a Scribe and minister of the Lord, because *Artaxerxes* and his seven Councillers sent him to do the work of a Scribe in *Judah* and *Jerusalem*? *EZR.* 7. 13, 14. *For as much as thou art sent of the King and of his seven Councillors.*

Pr. If *Artaxerxes* had destroyed the Temple, and the Worship of God, *Ezra* would not have taken any benefit of such a Decree and Commission.

Min. What warrant have you for that? if *Nebuchadnezzar* who destroyed the Temple, had made a Decree, That the Priests, and Levites, and people, should return and worship God at *Jerusalem*, would they have been such fools to refuse to return, till *Nebuchadnezzar* were dead, and some other King made such a Decree? Did *Jeremiah* reject the favour which was appointed by *Nebuchadnezzar*? *Jer.* 39. 11, 12. and conferred upon him by *Nebuzaradan*, *Jer.* 40. 4. who had burnt the House of the Lord? *2 King.* 25. 9.

Pr. But these were Heathens, who had never professed the true Religion, and so had not backslidden.

Min. The backsliding of Rulers makes them not incapable of doing good afterward. *Manasseh* had been Religiously educated, and became monstrously wicked, and yet was an instrument of Reformation afterward; and *Judah* did not refuse to serve the Lord, because *Manasseh*, who had so fearfully fallen away, did command them to serve the Lord, *2 Chron.* 33. 16.

Pr. *Manasseh* repented.

Minist. But do ye think that if he had commanded *Judah* to serve God, or the Lords Priests to sacrifice to the Lord before he repented, that these commands should have been rejected, because he was not truly penitent? It's the duty of all Kings, whether they be penitent or not, to command the Lords ministers and people to serve God.

The

The Orthodox ministers who had been banished in the time of the *Arrian* Persecution, and *Athanasius* among the rest, did not refuse to return to the exercise of their ministry upon the Edict of *Julian* the Apostate, who had been a professed Christian, and turned Pagan, and a despicable enemy and mocker of Christ; and tho' he made that Edict for ill ends, yet these godly zealous Servants of God made use of it. Ye may read the History in *Zozomens* Church-History, Book 5. Chap. 5.—where he shews, that he afflicted the Church in all things most bitterly and grievously, except that he recalled the Bishops and Priests which were banished in the time of *Constantius*; and that it was said, he gave not that command out of mercy or pity; but that either they by their mutual contentions might fight against the Church by an intestine War, and so fall away from their own Laws and Institutions, or that he might wrong the Estimation of *Constantius*, and might raise up hatred against him through the whole Empire, &c.

And *Georgius Horsnius* in his Ecclesiastick History, Pag. 93. saith, That *Julian* recalled *Athanasius* from Banishment to the place of one *George* an *Arrian*, a most naughty man, who had been slain a little before *Athanasius*'s return. There is no man more famous for Learning and Zeal, and steadfastness in the Church-History, than *Athanasius*; and I am sure, if ye have read the History of *Julian* the Apostate, ye will be ashamed to say that any of our Rulers are so

ill as he was, and yet none of these holy and Learned ministers made any scruple to obey his command when he called them to the work of their ministry. If many would compare their practices with the Scripture-rule, and examples in Scripture, and in Church-History, they would find that what they take for light and zeal, is but ignorance, and an humourous peevishness; who would have thought that ever any who had been members of the Church of *Scotland*, that besides the obligation common to them with other Protestant Churches, are by solemn Covenants obliged to extirpate Schism, and maintain the Kings person and authority, would have so far degenerate as to place their zeal and Religion in scarring at the Preaching and Hearing of the Gospel, because the ministers who preach it are permitted and allowed to preach it by the magistrates, who are bound as magistrates, as Christians, as Protestants, to permit, allow, countenance, protect by their authority the Preaching of the Gospel in this Kingdom?

Farm. Sir, I desire ye would return to answer what is said against the Ministers in that sixth Article of the Band.

Min. As for what they say of Ministers submitting to the Magistrates censures, and saying they would not have done the things they were charged with, if they had thought it would have offended them; it's a confused charge, and it is not easie to guess what they mean; they cannot prove, that any of those Ministers have done
any

any thing that will import an acknowledgment, that the Magistrate hath power of inflicting Ecclesiastick Censures, or of making Ecclesiastick Canons. And as for Civil Restraints of Imprisonment and Banishment, if they condemn submission to these, they will condemn all who have been imprisoned and banished ; and among the rest the Ministers who went to *Holland*, who did not only passively submit to Banishment, but also by their Subscription engaged not to return.

If any Minister hath done any thing which warrantably might have been forborn, or which might have been done as conveniently, or more conveniently at another time, in another place, in a way that would not have irritated or provoked the magistrate; if such a person hath made the foresaid acknowledgment, who can with reason condemn it ; for we owe thus much even to any private person, whom we should not needlessly provoke to anger if we can conveniently help it : but the contrivers of this bond, and those who go their way, are for needless provocations of the magistrate ; and if there be many ways of doing what is right upon the matter, they will chuse the way that is irritating to the Rulers, because it is irritating ; and shun that way which will not provoke the magistrate ; as if it were a duty to provoke the magistrate to wrath. And if any have needlessly provoked them, they will not allow him to give an innocent soft answer to turn away their wrath. But it is no wonder that they who are

for overthrowing the magistrate and the Government, be against all things that make for peace with them, or may tend to pacifie them when they are angry, and be for grievous words and things, which may stir up strife, and put evil betwixt the magistrate and subjects.

What they add, That these ministers have departed from the Courts of Christ, and subjection to the ministry, are meer calumnies. Do they think that ministers appearing before the magistrate when called, that by the magistrates Civil allowance of the peaceable exercise of the ministry, they might without disturbance preach the Gospel in such or such places, will prove that these ministers have departed from the Courts of Christ, and have changed their Courts, and so by common Law have changed their masters, and are become, of the ministers of Christ, the ministers of men. These are meer forgeries, that have no foundation but in their own fancy; nor any consonancy with common Law, but are against common sense and reason.

Although these ministers had bound themselves to answer when the magistrate would, it had been no more than men who compear before the magistrate use to do when required, that till they be called, they may in the meantime have their freedom. Now the peaceable exercise of the ministry, is in many respects preferable to Civil liberty. But it was the people, and not the minister, who gave bond to the Council, to present the minister when called, under

under such a penalty. It's another groundless slander, that they have given up, and utterly quit the Government, and a succession of a *Presbyterian* Ministry: for they have not by their making use of this liberty, bound up themselves from doing any thing in their places and stations which they might have done before, for the Government of the Church, and succession of a *Presbyterian* Ministry; and it's but a melancholly dream to imagine that the settled, fixed, peaceable exercise of the Ministry of the Gospel, under the protection of lawful authority, does swallow up the Government of the Church, extinguish the Ministry, and bury the work of Reformation. Is not the Preaching of the Gospel a part of the exercise of Christs visible Kingdom? Does the exercise of the Ministry destroy the Ministry? Or does the Preaching of the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, bury the work of Reformation?

Next, they charge these Ministers with Preaching the lawfulness of paying that tribute declared to be imposed for the bearing down of the true Worship of God which they falsely termed seditious Conventicles.

Pr. Sir, before ye speak any thing as to the paying of that tribute, I desire that ye would consider, that there were several Ministers who Preached against the paying of it, and I hope ye will not be rash in giving your opinion in that matter.

Min. I wish those who Preached against the paying of it, had made less haste, and had con-

ferred with their Brethren, and heard what they had to say from Scripture and Reason, ere they had adventured to preach such a new Doctrine, That subjects should not pay a tribute, which was concluded by a meeting of the Estates of the Nation, and for an end which is unquestionably good, the resisting of foreign Invasion.

It's, I suppose, a new Doctrine, That subjects should not pay tribute; and the preaching of new Doctrines is dangerous; it hath been the rashness of some that they were too hasty to preach their own private and very singular opinions; it were good, Ministers of the Gospel would forbear to say any thing to the people in preaching, but that of which they might say, *Thus saith the Lord*. They should have considered what danger they exposed the people to by this Doctrine: for either those who believed this Doctrine would persist in refusing to pay, and this would expose them to be eaten up by Soldiers; or they being distressed, would at length pay it, though they thought it unlawful, and this would debase and waste their Consciences, and prepare them to do other things which they thought unlawful; and this would encourage those who differed from them in other things, to take the same method in pressing them to conform to them; and some of the poor people who have stood out long, and at length yielded to pay, have exposed themselves to the scorn and derision of those who uplifted that Sess.

R. Seeing they declared that this Sess was imposed to bear down the true Worship of God, how could any with a good Conscience pay it ?

Min. Any who reads this part of the Band, and had not seen the Act of the Convention of Estates, would think that they had declared, that it was for bearing down the true Worship of God ; now there are no such words in the Act of Convention. Again, any who had not seen the Act, might think that if their words were true, that then the Convention of States were for bearing down whatsoever was the true Worship of God ; or that there was no true worship of God but in these meetings which the Magistrate calls seditious Conventicles. We should not make either words or things worse than they really are ; and we should at least deal as fairly with the Magistrate as with other men.

It hath been reported by persons of Honour, and of great candor, that the motion of setting up Prelacy (which hath been the cause of the sad suffering of *Presbyterians*) in *Scotland*, did not come of the Kings Majesty, but was repell'd by the King, when first moved by some *Scots men* ; and if they who moved it, had not vehemently insisted, and strongly alledged, that it would be easily effectuate, and would be acceptable to the people of *Scotland*, the King would never have set up Prelacy in *Scotland*. And any favour that hath been shewed to Non-conformists, hath principally flow'd from the King himself ; as Dr. *Owen* in his Answer to Dr.

Stilling-

Stillingfleets Sermon declareth. And in some places of his Majesties Dominions, *Presbyterians* have the publick worship of God without any disturbance; which shews, that the King doth not look upon all the Meetings of *Presbyterians*, for the worship of God, as seditious Conventicles; so that suppose that were said (which yet no judicious person will alledge) that there were no true worship of God, except in these Meetings which are called Conventicles; it would not be alledged, that it were the Magistrates design to bear down the true worship of God, seeing these Meetings in several places of these Kingdoms are not suppressed; and if some Preachers had not vented Doctrines which were really seditious at some of those Conventicles, *Presbyterian* Ministers and people, who designed nothing but the preaching and hearing of the Gospel of peace, would not have been molested as they were; but the seditious turbulent Doctrine of some, did breed much trouble to others, who were innocent.

It cannot be denied, that there were some Meetings where such Doctrine was taught by the Preachers, and applauded and practised by hearers, that it was no wonder that the Magistrate called them seditious. And if the Contrivers of this Bond, had set themselves to devise a way to confirm the Magistrate, in calling Conventicles seditious, they could not have fallen upon a more effectual way, than this Contrivance; which is indeed seditious, and will readily be imputed to many who abhor the seditious signs

signs and principles which are in this Bond.

As for the reason why this Sess should not be paid, *viz.* because it's declared to be imposed for an ill end ; they who are free to pay it, will retort, It's imposed for a good end, *viz.* to put the Kingdom in a posture of defence against Invasion ; and therefore it should be payed. I know a judicious Gentleman, who said he would pay his Sess for that end, which was unquestionably good, *viz.* the resisting of Foreign Invasion. If an ill design intended by those who lay on a Sess, render the paying of it unlawful, then suppose a Magistrate should impose a Sess for twenty necessary ends and uses, if there were but one ill end designed by him in imposing it, it would be unlawful for Subjects to pay that which is necessary for twenty good ends and uses, which were very absurd. If the Payer have no ill design in paying, the Magistrates ill design in imposing will not vitiate the Act of him that pays. Suppose a Robber say to a travelling man, I and my men must live, and therefore I require you to give me out of your hand so much money to maintain me and my men, or else I will kill you, and take all the money ye have ; the Traveller would not be guilty of the abusing of the money to maintain Robbers ; he gives it not for that end, but to preserve his life ; and gives a part to preserve the rest.

Christ commanded to give Tribute to the *Roman* Emperor, which was exacted by the *Romans* to maintain the Government over the *Jews*, which was destructive both to their Religious

ligious and Civil Liberties. *Paul* directs to give Tribute to those who were then Magistrates, who were Heathen Idolaters. Now the Lord hath declared in his word, That every unrenewed man serves divers Lusts and pleasures, and makes provision for the flesh to fulfil the Lusts of it; they are Idolaters, make their belly or their Riches, or their Pleasures, their God; they act from carnal Principles, and for carnal ends. They who pay the Sess, are not certain that the Magistrate will imploy it for bearing down Conventicles, they may put it to some other use; they might get some other thing to do with it; but we are certain, that Heathen Rulers, Idolaters, and every unrenewed man will serve his Lusts with the Tribute, or Rent, or Debt that is paid to him; or with the Alms that is given to him in his distress; and yet Subjects are commanded to pay Tribute to Heathen ungodly Emperors; and Tenants and Debtors should pay their Rent and Debts to ungodly Landlords and Creditors, though they declared when they were requiring it, that they had a mind to misimploy it to some ill use; if the Declaration of the Magistrate, that he will abuse the Tribute, make it sure that he will abuse it, and so bar Subjects from paying; the Declaration of the God of Truth, That every ungodly, unrenewed man will abuse what is payed to him, or given him out of charity, is much surer; and so men would be bound up to pay or give any thing to any person that were in an unrenewed state; and thus we should
be

be obliged to defraud ungodly men, in not paying them their Debts; and to let Heathens, Pagans, and ungodly poor people starve; because we know from the Scripture, that they will make what they get, Provision for their Lusts, which they serve, and offer it to some Idol-lust; this were a new method of effectuating what some of the furious Anabaptists designed, to kill all the wicked, that there might be none but Saints in the World.

I shall subjoyn the words of the Author of the exercitation concerning usurped powers, who was supposed to be Mr. Herle. Chap. 3. 2. *Payment of Taxes, and bearing other Impositions for the usurped power, where and while we are under his compulsive power; because such Contributions may and will be taken whether I will pay them or not; and I yield them under his enforcement, as a Ransom for my life, or liberty, or somewhat else, that is better to me than the payment; and consequently I am to chuse the parting with it, as the less evil, rather than with that which is better; which to lose, is to incur a greater evil for avoiding of a less.*

In this point Mr. Ascham the aforementioned Author, part 2. Chap. 1. pag. 35. determineth well, had he not contradicted (as I understand him) that he delivers in this and the next Chapter, with that Assertion of his, part 1. Chap. 6. pag. 25. distinguishing rightly betwixt that which cannot be had, nor the value of it, unless I actually give it; and that which may be taken, whether I contribute it or not: Of this latter kind is
pay-

paying of Taxes in this case. * Herein I am but

* Nolite igitur fortunam incul-
pam convertere,
neque Regis inju-
riam, hujus cri-
men putare, nec
consilium ex ne-
cessitate, nec vo-
luntatem ex vi
interpretari. Ci-
cero Orat. 39. pro
C. Rabirio Postu-
mo. So he defend-
eth Posthumus his
changing his Ro-
man Gown to a
Cloak at Alexan-
dria, as compell-
ed by King Pto-
lomie.

morally passive, as a man that is
fallen into the hands of a pack of
bloody Thieves, and being deman-
ded it, takes his Purse out of his
Pocket and delivers it to them;
though with his own hand, saith
the Author, he puts his Purse in-
to their hands, yet the Law calls
that not a gift, nor excuseth the
Thief for taking it, but all con-
trary; or a man apprehended by a
party of the invading Enemies,
or Usurpers Army, walks or rides
along with them to their muster
or battel, when as he cannot es-
cape them; and otherways they
would draw him. But it is com-
monly objected thus.

Object. This payment, or ther charge, is taken,
and will be used to an evil se, as to maintain U-
surpation.

Ans. But that is beyond my deliberation, not in
my power to prevent: It will not be avoided, by
putting them to force it from me, but rather more
Gain will accrue to them, and Damage to me; if I
stand out, my denying will be made an occasion
to them to take more. This cause is like that of en-
tring into a Covenant with these, that in covenant-
ing, we know before hand, will swear by a false
God; wherein Divines * resolve the Party swear-

* Augustinus ad Publicoram Epist 154. Gen. 21. 31, 32.

ing by the true God, participates not in his sin, that swears by a false one; inasmuch as he communicates with him in the Covenant, not in the Oath taken in his part, and provides thereby for his necessary security; and thus did Abraham and Jacob in their respective Covenants with Abimelech and Laban.

I shall add the words of another Presbyterian Minister, Edward Gee Minister in Lancaster, in his excellent Treatise of the Divine Right and Original of the Civil Magistrate, published Anno 1658. pag. 368. where he is shewing what may be lawfully done by people under the power of an Usurper. He says, 2. *And therewithal such as are peculiarly arising from that state of subduedness, as the necessity that is incumbent to do, or part with the thing required, for the avoidance of greater loss, or suffering to come; if the Subject detect it, or the greater conveniency, safety or emolument, which there is to ones self, to his Neighbour, or to the publick, in doing them, in denying, as the circumstances of the Imposal-lye, though were it not so imposed, it would not be eligible; though we are obliged to nothing jussu ejus, or upon the intuition of his Command, yet we may do many things, eo jubente, he commanding; and should do, eo premente, he enforcing them; and we have many things to do, ipso seu volente, seu nolente, whether he will, or forbid the doing of them, &c.* By which passages it appears, That those godly learned Presbyterians in those Treatises, which they wrote of purpose to maintain the Kings Authority when he was thrust from it; and to
shew

shew that the Subject might do nothing which might prejudice his right ; or which might be interpreted to be an owning of the title of the then Usurpers, who had forced the King out of his Dominions ; yet they shew, that Taxes might be paid to the Usurpers ; and that they who payed it, were not accountable for the abuse that the Usurpers made of it ; which lets us see how far they would have been from refusing to pay Tribute to the rightful Magistrate, though imposed for some wrong end. And I cannot but here take notice, how constantly and courageously *Presbyterians* owned the Kings Authority ; when he was thrust from the exercise of it ; and how careful they were, that Subjects might do nothing which might be prejudicial to his Title, when he was violently disposed of his Kingdoms.

I shall not speak of the Testimonies they gave in preaching and in print, against the Usurpers, upon the account of their usurpation, and for asserting of the Kings Title. I wish their Loyalty had been better remembred ; but any suffering they have met with since, will not make them repent of their constant adherence, from a principle of Conscience to their Allegiance, and covenanted Duty to their rightful Sovereign.

If any will but look to the frontispiece of Mr. Gee's Book, where there is an empty Chair of State, and the Scepter and Crown lying upon the ground ; and below, the King standing, and above his head, *non est potestas nisi a Deo*, Rom. 13. and

and under his feet *θεοκρατία*, and opposite to him upon the other side, an Armed-Soldier with his hand in the handle of his Sword, meaning the Parliament; and under his feet *ἀντοκρατορία*, and below, *Absolom* hanging upon a tree, and *Joab* darting him, 2 Sam. 18. and the Woman of *Abel* casting *Sheba's* head over the wall, 2 Sam. 20. They may see *Presbyterians* Loyalty and courage in a time of hazard; when others, who afterward would have engrossed all Loyalty to themselves, were very calm; and some of them speaking in another Dialect.

Mr. *Rutherford* used to keep Family-fasts, to pray for the King in his distress. There is no Loyalty comparable to that which is founded upon the word and Covenant, and the Principle of Conscience, bound by the Word and Oath of God. The late King advised those who were desirous to befriend him in his straits, to preach the Obligation of the Covenant, which binds to maintain his Person and Authority.

The new Principles of Confusion, which are opposite to the Magistrates Authority, and to the paying of Tribute to Rulers, are directly opposite to, and inconsistent with the Principles and Practices of *Presbyterians*; and seem to have been devised by *Jesuits*, and then craftily conveyed into the heads of weak people, distempered with sad suffering; or having Zeal without Knowledge, that they might at once render those people ridiculous, and expose their possessions as a prey, and their lives to the Sword, and their profession of Religion to contempt and

scorn; as if it made men frantick, and deprived them of the use of common Reason and sense.

I heard from a godly and learned Minister, That he heard a great Zealot against the paying of the Sess, say, *That whatever was unlawful for a man to do voluntarily, was unlawful for him to do upon Legal or Physical constraint*; and another said, *If men on constraint might pay Sess, which they should not voluntarily do, without Legal and Physical constraint feared to follow; then the three Children might have worshipped Nebuchadnezers Image, because they were under constraint.* And when it was answered, that there were some actions in the substance of the fact sinful, that no constraint could make lawful, such as Idolatry; and some, which outward Circumstances made lawful or unlawful: that distinction was denied; such is the ignorance of some of those Teachers.

Another made the paying of the Sess, like the offering of Children to *Moloch*. It's a great pity, that well-meaning people, who from a Principle of Conscience, are willing rather to suffer, than to sin, should be misguided by ignorant men, and drawn into needless calamities, to the ruin of their Families, and the reproach of Religion.

• They add, *That these Ministers advised the Prisoners to take the Bond, &c.*

Ans. Those Prisoners being taken at *Bothwel-bridge*, were pressed to bind themselves not to take up Arms against the Kings Person and

Au-

Authority, under the Certification of no less punishment than Death.

Now as we heard from the larger Catechism, *It's the duty of inferiors to defend and maintain the Persons and Authority of their Superiors*; which imports much more than the not taking up Arms against them and their Authority.

2. Though they had not been Subjects, but only Prisoners of war in the victors power, to deprive them of life or liberty for ever; I suppose they could not have been blamed for the preservation of their life, to have given in such a Bond; some who were taken Prisoners by *Cromwel*, for their liberty engaged not to carry Arms against him; and I do not remember, that any censured them for it; what they say in a *Parentesis*, that hazard will not make a moral change in actions, is a palpable error; if there were twenty with drawn-swords, waiting at the Church-door to kill a Minister, if he should come to preach; it were rash, furious, self-destroying, self-murdering Zeal for a Minister to venture to go to preach at that time, in despite of the hazard, so certain, visible, and unavoidable, and yet it were his duty at another time to preach, where there were no such hazard; for a Merchant to cast his Wares in the Sea in a calm, were wicked folly, contrary to the 8th. Command, a stealing from his Family and himself; and yet in a storm, *Paul* and the Passengers and Mariners thought it their duty to cast out both Goods and Tackling of the Ship.

This Subscription would have no ways condemned innocent self-defence against the unjust violence of Papists, which the Reformed Churches made use of, when they did cast off the yoke of the Whore. *David* and his men had Arms, but they were not taken up against *Saul's* Person and Authority, as appears by *David's* practice, who would neither himself kill, nor suffer his men to kill *Saul*, and that upon the account of his Authority, being the Lords Anointed; and though *Saul* in his distemper, calls *David* his enemy; yet in his lucide intervals, he calls him his Son.

Indeed the engaging not to take up Arms against the Kings Person and Authority, and any lawful Oath of Allegiance, could not consist with such Arms as the Contrivers of this Band, and Sanchar Declaration would be at; for their Arms are designed to destroy the Magistrates person without mercy, and their Authority, and the established Civil Government which hath no parallel that I know of, except that of the *Boors* in *Germany* under *Thomas Munster*; and after, under *John of Leyden*; which Usurpation being not only of private persons, but also being against the Magistrates person and Authority, was justly condemned, as a fury, by all the Reformed Churches.

At length after this long Inditement, they come to give sentence against these Ministers who have accepted of the peaceable exercise of their Ministry, and all who voted for that acceptance, all who have heard and pleaded for them,

them, trafficked for union with them ; all that do not testifie against them, and deport themselves suitably to their testimony ; all who do not join publickly with the Brethren, who testifie against them. The sentence is in effect deposition as far as their power reaches ; they say indeed that they have not, nor assume to themselves authoritative sentences of deposition and suspension against these Ministers ; there is some modesty here ; yet they specifie the censures, which should be inflicted upon these Ministers ; no less will serve than deposition or suspension. It's somewhat strange that they who had the confidence to depose the Magistrate as formally as they could, did not formally depose these Ministers also ; but though they do not formally depose them, yet they do it materially and effectually, in that they will neither hear them, nor receive Sacraments from them. And no wonder, seeing they had before declared them to be the Ministers of men, & not of Christ ; the ground of this sentence is a Scripture (2 *Thes.* 3. 6.) but misunderstood, and so misapplied ; for the Apostle is not there directing to withdraw from the Lords Ordinances, from the hearing of the Word, or Administration of the Sacraments, or from fellowship with the Church in the Worship of God ; but he forbids ordinary, familiar, private converse with disorderly persons, (it's a metaphor taken from Soldiers, who keep not their rank) idle, and yet busie-bodies, busie about that which did not belong to them, such as are spoken of 1 *Tim.* 5. 13. who were idle, wander-

ing about from house to house, ratlers, busie-bodies, speaking things which they ought not. The authors of this Band have made such a breach upon all order, both in speaking and engaging to do things which they ought not, and which tend to all confusion, that if they had understood this Scripture, and their own way, they would have seen their way condemned in this Scripture, from which they would condemn others.

2. Orthodox Interpreters think that the withdrawing which is enjoined in this Scripture, is to be after the Church hath taken due notice of the disorder of such persons, and they after admonition continue disobedient, see the *Dutch Annotations*, which cite *Mat. 18. 15. 1 Cor. 5. 11.* as parallel places ; and *Diodate*, *Mr. Dickson*, and *Mr. Fergusen* upon the place.

If private persons were left to Excommunicate all whom they thought disorderly, it would breed great confusion ; and if private persons be not to be thus withdrawn from till the Church hath noted them, and proceeded by lesser censures to the censure of Excommunication ; How insolent an act is this, for a few inconsiderable persons, who, as they confess themselves, have no capacity to inflict any censure, to declare that they will carry themselves towards so many ministers, who have never been convened or heard, much less censured by any Church-Judicatory ; and others who adhere to them, and all who testifie not against them, and do not publickly join with those who
testifie

testifie against them, as if they were deposed and Excommunicate? and the insolency was the greater, because they knew that the ministers who were not indulged, did think these young men who had not come to this height of Schism, censurable.

I am certainly informed, that this spirit of Schism hath prevailed so far in some, that they will not have private Christian fellowship with any who hear Indulged ministers; though they be persons of so blameless and Christian conversation, that they have nothing to cast at them for, but this, that they have clearness to hear Indulged ministers. This joining in the Worship of God where these ministers preach, they account a joining with the people of these abominations, ignorantly perverting that place, *Ezra* 9. 14. as if joining in the commanded Worship of God, were like the *Israelites* joyning in forbidden marriages with the cursed Nations. *But as the fool thinks, the bell clinks.*

The least that they require of these deposed and Excommunicate ministers, is, that they stand in judgment before these ministers, and be judged by them who have followed the Lord, and kept themselves free of these defections. The least I perceive that they will accept of, is no less than an acknowledging of Prelates, and setting up Prelacy.

Pr. Sir, ye seem now to be jesting, and not in earnest.

Min. No, Sir, I am in good earnest; and if ye will consider what Prelacy is, I suppose ye will

will not deny what I say. Ye know your self, that these Ministers whom they mean, and who fall not in one of the Classes mentioned, were never for any thing known above four, and some say they were but three, and a little after this Band one of them was laid aside from Preaching. And a Gentleman told me, that he was credibly informed, that he went hence to *Ireland*, and joined with the Conformists there. But suppose that they were four, yea fourteen, that would not make them the Plurality in a capacity to judg, to suspend, or depose the Indulged, and not Indulged Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*; and yet we see they have a jurisdiction over all the rest of the Ministers, who must stand before them, and be judged by them, and stand and fall in judgment, as these judges shall determine. And as they engross the power of suspension and deposition, so consequently the power of Ordination; and in their last Article they talk of a Gospel-ministry, rightly chosen, and rightly Ordained, and they promise to rectifie what was amiss in former Ordinations. Now two or three, or four persons engrossing the power of Ordination and Jurisdiction over all the *Presbyterian* Ministers of the Church of *Scotland*, are Prelates.

Doctor Gauden defines the Office of a Bishop thus : *Episcopal presidency and authority, is a Sovereign power, and Spiritual jurisdiction in Ordination, Confirmation, Censures, rebuking, silencing, Excommunication, Absolution, and other exercises of Ecclesiastick power, without, above and against Presbyters and people.*

This

This description, if ye will take Confirmation out of it, seems to agree much better to these new Prelates than to the old. They arrogate a Sovereign power, a power above all *Presbyterian* Ministers, who must stand before them when they set to judg them; and they must stand and fall as they are pleased to determine. Their Sovereignty is the more absolute, that their Dignity proceeds of themselves; and men use not to limit their own power when they have it, at their own making or taking; the old Prelates depend upon the King, and they are sent from Court. It's true, *Athanasius* *

finds fault with that *ubi ille Canen ut e palatio mittaturis qui futurus est Episcopus*. Yet any thing that is in its nature excessive, and inclined to pass

* *Epist. ad Solitariam vitam Agentes.*

bounds, is less dangerous when it is limited by some other thing on which it depends, than when it is left to its own indefinite appetite or inclination. Their new Prelates depend neither upon King nor *Kesar*, but are independent, their Prelacy proceeds of themselves; this makes it very dreadful, like the Dominion of the *Chaldeans*, *Hab. 1. 7.* *They are terrible and dreadful, their judgment and dignity shall proceed of themselves.* They were terrible, because as Mr. *Hutcheson* upon the place saith, *They would be their own carvers in all matters of advantage and honour, standing to no law either of Nature, or Nations, in dealing with a terrified and subdued people, but meerly following their own will, armed with power.*

If, ye say, they are not designed Lords, nor a Sovereign power ascribed to them in the Bond, but they are designed Ministers, that is, Servants. I answer, if folk will be beguiled with names, the Pope will call himself *Servus servorum*, a Servant of Servants; but there is a real Sovereignty given to them, when a Jurisdiction over all *Presbyterian* Ministers to suspend, depose, and dispose of their Ministry as they please, is ascribed to them. And the other Prelates deal more candidly in taking the name of Sovereignty and Lordship, seeing they have the thing.

Is it not a strange arrogance that a Presbyter, or two or three Presbyters, shall claim a stated Jurisdiction over a great multitude of Presbyters, who have the same office with themselves? they either have that power over their Brethren by vertue of their Ministerial Office, as they are Presbyters, or by vertue of some other Office: not by vertue of the Office of a Presbyter or Minister; for then one and the same Office should make one Presbyter a Sovereign and Lord, and another Presbyter his subject; a Presbyter as a Presbyter cannot have dominion over a Presbyter; for one and the same Office cannot make a man Sovereign over another, who hath the same Office that he hath. If they have this Sovereign power over their Brethren by vertue of some other Office than the Office of a Minister or Presbyter, then let them tell us what Office this is, if it be not the Office of a Prelate.

2. It hath not yet been proven that the Lord gave a Sovereign power, and Spiritual jurisdiction to any one of his Ministers, no not to the Apostles over the rest. *Paul Bains* in his *Diocesan Trial*, Pag. 73, 77. shews, that a majority of directive and corrective power, such a power as Bishops claim, is more than Ministerial. And *Mr. Rutherford* in his *Divine Right of Church-Government*, saith, *Nor do we find that the Apostles had jurisdiction over Pastors in the Scripture, nor in any Ecclesiastick Records, but where Papacy was working.* See Pag. 21.

There is but one Lord in the Church, *Ephes.* 4. and Christ hath forbidden Lordship, and enjoined ministry, and serving, *Luk.* 22. 24. *1 Pet.* 5. 3. *Non requiritur in dominatione humilitas, sed ipsa Dominatio prohibetur*, saith *Whitaker*. *Christus de re dominantur, non autem de modo dominandi, hoc vel illo modo dominantur*, saith *Junius*. The work of all Church-Officers is a Ministerial work, not only Doctors and Pastors, but Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists were appointed, *ἡς ἑργον διακονίας*, For the work of the Ministry, *Ephes.* 4. 12. *2 Cor.* 4. 5. *Paul* calls himself a fellow-servant with *Epaphras*, *Col.* 1. 7. with *Tychicus*, *Col.* 4. 7. *Paul's* dignity consisted not in Lording over other Ministers, but in labouring more abundantly than others; the Apostles claimed no Mastery, or stated jurisdiction over other Ministers, but they did draw with them as yoke-fellows, and fought with them in their Spiritual warfare, as fellow Soldiers, and wrought with them as fellow-labourers, *Phil.* 4. 3. *Phil.* 2. 25.

2. 25. *Phil.* 2. *Rom.* 16. 3. they engrossed not the power of Jurisdiction in the Synod of *Jerusalem* to themselves, for the Presbyters judged with them, the Decrees of the Council, *Act.* 16. 4. were Ordained by the Apostles and Elders, *Δογματὰ τὰ κεκειμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.* The Church at *Antioch* sends *Paul* to *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 15. the Officers of the Church at *Antioch* lay hands on *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Act.* 13. 1, 2, 3. *Paul* and *Barnabas* are sent with a Collection, *Act.* 11. 29, 30. the Apostles claimed no negative in Presbyteries or Synods, in Ordination, Excommunication, &c.

The Apostles were extraordinary Ambassadors, had infallible instructions by their Doctrine and practice, did shew the Platform of the Church, were not limited to any fixed charge, and so might exercise their Ministerial authority in all places where they came; they were to lay the foundations of Churches. But that they had any such stated Jurisdiction over other Ministers, as Prelates claim over Presbyters, is yet to be proven, for any thing I know; their instructing Ministers and Churches in their duty, and reproving their sins, will not prove it, for the Prophets did so, and yet they had no stated Jurisdiction over the Priests. *Paul* reprov'd *Peter*, but had not jurisdiction over him.

That *Timothy* or *Titus* had such a stated Jurisdiction over the Ministers of *Ephesus* and *Creet*, is yet to be proven; that they had the sole power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, and that the Ministers of *Ephesus* and *Creet* had no power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, is not yet proven.

The

The Apostle directs them to Ordain, but that they are directed to do it alone, and not in conjunction with other Ministers, is yet to be proven; *Lay hands suddenly on no man*, is a Direction applicable to every Minister; there are multitudes of Directions given them, that cannot be denied to be given to all Ministers; and that some Directions are given to them, as Prelates, and some as Presbyters, is as easily denied as affirmed.

But though it were granted, that those extraordinary Officers in founding Churches at first, might do some things which ordinary Ministers might not do; this would be no warrant for these two or three, who were but very ordinary persons, to claim a Jurisdiction over the rest. Whence have they their power? No man can receive any thing of this nature, except it be given him from Heaven, Joh. 3. 27. Let us see their Patent, that we may know if it be leill come.

They must first shew a Warrant from the word for such a Prelatical Sovereignty, and then let us see how they came by it; no man should take any Honour in the Church to himself, at his own hand; he must be called of God, as was *Aaron*. If they say, That such a Sovereign Jurisdiction is not discharged, and therefore it's lawful. I answer,

I. The Offices and Officers of the House of God, which are in the Scripture, are positively instituted and constituted of God, 1 Cor. 12. 28. *God hath set, &c. Ephes. 4. 11. God hath given, &c. Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8.* If God hath not set these new Sovereign Judges, Ministers should not stand

stand before them, as Judges; if God hath not given them for Sovereign Judges, we should not receive them; and if they be not given, their Office is not a gift of Grace. It's a graceless thing, and we have nothing to do with it.

2. It's not enough that an Office which is exercised in the name of another, be not discharged or forbidden, it must be charged and commanded; if a man should claim to himself some new Office of Justice, or should intrude himself into some Office which were settled by Law, would that be a sufficient defence for him, that such an Office was not discharged, nor he forbidden to take such an Office? it would be replied, He had no Law nor Command, or Warrant for what he did: it's not enough to make a man an Ambassador, that he is not discharged to go Ambassador, he must have a positive Commission.

3. The Lord in forbidding us to add to his word, hath discharged to add any Spiritual Offices to those which he hath instituted in the Word; and I see not how those who take on them to make new Spiritual Offices in the Church, can hold out new Spiritual work for those new Officers; and so we shall have new significant Symbols and Sacraments, new worship; when they made the Office of the Pope, they cut out new work for him, to make new Articles of Faith, to dispence with the Laws of God, &c. or if they do not this, they take somewhat from the formerly established Officers, and appropriate it to those new ones; the Presbyters

dyters were first bereaved of the power of Ordination, and then of the power of Jurisdiction, *ut aliquid faceret Episcopus, quod non faceret Presbyter.*

If they object, That the rest of the Presbyters need not, except they please, subject themselves to these Ministers; and if they consent to subject themselves to them, and stand in Judgment before them, and submit their ministry to their disposal, then they get this Sovereign power by the Ministers voluntary consent; and then *volenti non fit injuria*; may not Ministers part with their power, and put it in the hand of one, or two, or three for unity and order? I answer,

1. They do as much as they can to necessitate and force the Ministers to subject themselves to those new Sovereign Judges; for as far as in them lyes, they effectually despise them; and in effect excommunicate them by withdrawing from them, until they stand in Judgment before their new Lords and Sovereigns, and come in their will.

2. It's a great and dangerous error to imagine, that Ministers of the Gospel may dispose of their ministerial power, as a man may dispose of his money; and so may either quit all, or give part and retain the rest; retain the power of preaching, and quit the power of governing, in conjunction with others; for a Minister hath not Dominion over his ministerial Function, as a man hath over his money; but he is obliged to retain all that Authority that the
Lord

Lord hath given him for edification, and to make full proof of his Ministry, as he will be answerable to his Master, who will require an account of the Talents he hath given him to occupy with ; and therefore suppose the *Presbyterian* Ministers were so demented, as to renounce their ministerial Authority, in favour of their new Judges, this could not make their Sovereign Jurisdiction warrantable, because this surrender made to them, would be a *non habente potestatem* ; for Ministers cannot give away their Authority to another, and therefore their new Judges would still be Usurpers, both in usurping a Dominion which the Lord hath not given to Ministers, and then taking it to themselves without any title.

The next thing in Dr. *Gaudens* Definition, is the exercise of this Sovereign power and Spiritual Jurisdiction in the several Acts, as Ordination, Confirmation, Censures, Rebuking, Silencing, Excommunication, Absolution, &c. If we may conclude from the practice of these new Prelates, how Sovereign, high and absolute, they will be in their acts of power, we have some ground to think, they will out-do any Prelates that have been before them ; for they have really, though not formally deposed and excommunicated the Ministers who differ from them, before any Process, Tryal or hearing granted to these Ministers ; and one of them hath very summerly excommunicated the King, the Duke of *York*, the Duke of *Monmouth*, and several Peers and Officers of State. This is pretty
high

high flown at the first flight, it's but now and then that the Bishop of *Rome*, the Pope himself, plays such pranks as these. Ordinary Bishops use to have formal processes, and they allow Presbyters to have some share in the trial, and leading of the process against persons to be Excommunicate, and they do not use to Excommunicate Kings and Princes.

Ambrose the Bishop of *Millain* was somewhat singular in his censure of *Theodosius* the Emperour, in keeping him seven months from entering within the Church-doors. I grant, saith *Hornius* in his Church-History, this censure of *Ambrose* is not approved of all ; but there are none who can or ought to disapprove the humility and repentance of *Theodosius*, who patiently endured the sharp reproofs of *Ambrose*, and did give example to the whole Church. But it's rare to find great ones of *Theodosius* disposition; there are considerable difficulties objected against the Excommunication of Supreme Magistrates. And the fault of *Theodosius* was so singular; for in his passion at a popular sedition in *Theſſalonica*; in which the President and some Noblemen were killed, he sent in Soldiers, who killed seven thousand persons of all ages and sexes, both guilty and innocent. And then the Emperour was a man so holy, humble and tender, and *Ambrose* a Bishop of so great authority, and so venerable and beloved, that if any ordinary Bishop would attempt to imitate *Ambrose* in this, he would readily find that he had mistaken his measures, and would not find that he had to do with a

Theodosius, or that he himself were an *Ambrose*. But as this is certain, that the Excommunication of Magistrates, Masters and Parents, does not make void their Magistratical, Masterly and Paternal authority; so this is granted, that as it is Church-Judicatories, and not single persons that should Excommunicate ;

* *Rutherford's Peaceable Plea*, Pag. 5. saith, The Church, not one single man, hath the power of Discipline ; if one Pastor himself alone should Excommunicate, the Excommunication were null both in the Court of Christ, & his Church.

and * that these Judicatories must not only consider, whether the fault deserve Excommunication, but also whether they have authority over the person or persons who are scandalous ; and withal, as Mr. *Durham* upon the

Commands saith, they would consider when censures, by reason of some circumstances, prove not edifying but hurtful to the Church and persons concerned. For, saith he, that which warranteth debarring and censures of all sorts, is edification ; and when that end cannot be gained to a people or person, such censures may be omitted. — Or upon the censure would probably miss its end, which is edification, and would weaken the authority of the Ordinance of Discipline, if not hazard the liberty of the Gospel ; in that case he thinks that exclusion from the Sacrament by a sentence, may be forborn.

But as for this late Excommunication, judicious sober persons are grieved and much ashamed to hear of it ; and it's matter of sport and derision to others ; and it's more than probable

that

that Jesuits take advantage of the distempers of weak persons, to drive them under pretext of zeal to such Pope-like pranks, to make the Popes Excommunications of Princes less odious, and to render *Presbyterians* odious to Rulers; but any who will not shut their eyes, may see that such extravagancies are inconsistent with *Presbyterian* principles and practices.

Dr. Gauden adds, That this Sovereign Jurisdiction is without, above, against Presbyters and people. In all these their new Prelates have the pre-eminency. For the first it is indeed true, that Prelates need not, if they please, desire the presence or advice of Presbyters, for they claim the sole authority of Ordination and Jurisdiction, and the Presbyters have no concurrence in authoritative acts.

The *Author of the seasonable case*, speaking of the Bishops nomination of the Moderators of the Meetings of Exercise, has written, that the Bishop did it with the Synod; this seemed to give the Synod a concurrence in the nomination of the Moderators, and therefore all the Printed Copies which I saw were mended with a Pen, and the *with* was turned to *in*, which turned the Synods concurrence into a meer presence.

A Diocesan Synod, saith Mr. William Scot, is only an *Episcopal Visitation*, and not a Council properly so called: and cites Bellar. de Concil. lib. 1. cap. 4. *Diocesana concilia sunt in quibus conveniunt tantum Presbyteri unius Episcopatus & is Episcopus præest, cujus generis rarissima exstant, nec immerito, nam vix dici possunt concilia, cum in iis*

nullus sit qui jurisdictionem habet, præter unum Episcopum, qui præest. A Council is, wherein those who are assembled have every one of them a part of the joint-power and jurisdiction belonging to that Council, as every Senator hath in the Senate. The comparing of the Act of Glasgow, June 3. 1610, anent Visitations, with the Act of Parliament relating to it, sheweth that Diocesan Synods are Episcopal Visitations; the Bishop summons to them in his own name, makes the Clerk appoint a Substitute or Vicegerent when he pleases; he only sententiates, deposes, suspends; if he at any time number votes, and conclude according to the plurality, that is not done by vertue of the Act of Glasgow, but by tolerance of the Bishop; who does it to settle himself in possession. But when they please they will not so much as suffer a matter to come to voicing and therefore they who cannot come to a Bishops particular Visitation, when he or his Substitute visits the Kirks of his Diocess severally, which was wont to be called *Visitatio plena*, he cannot go to the Diocesan Synod, which is nothing but a superficial shuffled Visitation, devised to hold in the Bishops travel in going through the Diocess to make a full Visitation.

But suppose they were Councils, yet they are not free, for the Bishop by his negative, whether in the Synod, or out of the Synod, even in a Court inferior to the Synod, may dash all done in the Synod; yea he may do it by his Affirmatives in the very Synod, so that the Presbyters are only in the nature of Counsellors. Thus far he.

From

From which we see the Bishop claims the sole authority, and he might act without Presbyters if he pleased; yet they use not to act without their Presbyters; and use to seek their advice and counsel; but their new Prelates do not desire the advice or presence of Presbyters; the old Prelates are so discreet, that they suffer the Presbyters to sit beside them as Counsellors; but these new ones do neither admit them to sit or stand as Counsellors, but require them to stand as guilty to be judged. And so Dr. *Gauden*'s definition is more verified in them than in the former Bishops.

As for the next Clause in the Doctors description, *viz.* above Presbyters, it agrees also to their new Prelates; and their superiority over Presbyters, is the more intollerable, that there is no kind of pretext for it, for they are designed only Ministers; now a Minister as a Minister to be above Ministers, is an usurpation the more intollerable that it is not colourable with any pretext, either Divine or humane. The old Prelates plead a superiority *Jure Regio*, which King *James* they say thought their surest title, and that they had best to hold them by *Jure Jacobi*. Some plead from Analogy, that as the high Priest was over the Priests, so the Bishop may be over the Presbyters. But to let pass the answer of the Typicalness of the Office of the high Priest, I have not yet seen any argument to prove that the high Priest had a Sovereign Jurisdiction over the rest of the Priests; he might do several things which the rest of the Priests

might not do, as some servants have more eminent service in a family, and yet no masterly or Sovereign power over other servants, who have not so eminent service allotted to them. They have a pretext also from the *Asian* Angels, because there one Angel in the singular number is written to; it's true, that reason taken from the singular number, to prove that it must needs be a single person, is no solid argument, especially in a mystical Book, such as the *Revelation* is, in which sometimes one is spoken of in the Plural number, as in the first Chapter, the one Spirit of God is called seven Spirits. The four Beasts, the four and twenty Elders, are not four individual persons, or four and twenty single Elders. The seven Angels, *Rev.* 8. 2, 6. & 15. 1. are not to be restricted to seven individual Angels. The Woman clothed with the Sun, the Whore, the Beast, the Dragon, are names of the singular number, and yet signify a collection of many Individuals. When the Angel of the Lord is said to incamp about them who fear the Lord, it's expounded of Angels, because one Angel cannot be properly said to incamp.

Again, they have a pretext of Superiority, as Bishops over Presbyters. It's true, *Presbyterians* make it evident from Scripture, that Bishop and Presbyter are one there. And Dr. *Hammond* to evite the dint of this argument, was forced to alledg, That all the Presbyters mentioned in the Scripture, were Bishops and not Ministers; for he saw that he behoved either to lose the

Bishop

Bishop or the Presbyter in the Bible; for not only are Presbyters called Bishops, but they are made Bishops by the Holy Ghost; now to say that the Holy Ghost made them nominally Bishops, but not really Bishops, is very injurious to the work of the Spirit, as if it were productive only of an empty name. And it takes away the force of the argument, *Feed the flock of God over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, or Bishops.* If they had only the name of Bishops, and not the Office, the argument would not be cogent; for a meer empty name and title, doth not oblige a man who gets it, to any work. And as *Paul* says, *That the Holy Ghost made the Elders of the Church of Ephesus Bishops:* So the Apostle *Peter* exhorts Elders to take inspection to do the work of Bishops, *Ἐπισκοπεύετε.* Neither doth the name of Bishop import any primacy of one Minister over others; for the Apostle *John*[†] taketh the love of pre-eminence or primacy in *Diotrephes*; but *Paul* commends the desire of the Office of a Bishop, which shews that the Office of a Bishop doth not import a primacy.

But though Bishop and Presbyter be one in the Scripture, yet it cannot be denied, that afterward the name of Bishop began to be appropriate to some Ministers in eminent Cities, and afterward Ordination, and then Jurisdiction, was by degrees taken from the Presbyters. It's true, *Presbyterians* when they are urged with these humane stories, and with the holiness of the Ancients, who were Bishops; they do not

deny, but praise the holiness and zeal of these Ancients, who were Bishops; but neither the holiness of the men, nor the Ecclesiastick custom will prove the Divine right of the Episcopacy pleaded for. If any would plead for Polygamy from the holiness of *Abraham* the Father of the Faithful, and of *Jacob*, who as a Prince did prevail with God in weeping, and making supplication; Or from the long continuance of that Polygamy; the answer were easie, *From the beginning it was not so*; God made male and female. So when they plead that Bishop and Presbyter were distinguished in after-times, it's answered, *From the beginning it was not so*, God made Bishop and Presbyter one; man should not have made them two, nor made the one less to make the other greater than he was by Divine constitution. Yet it cannot be denied that this is a very plausible pretext, for setting up Bishops above Presbyters. But their new Prelates have no pretext, nor colour imaginable for their Jurisdiction over Presbyters; for they pretend to no other name but Ministers, and yet they will Lord it over their fellow Ministers; and thus their Sovereignty is more intollerable, because it hath no kind of colour or pretext for it.

The last clause in the Doctors Definition against *Presbyters*, is pretty ingenious; for Prelates engross the power that *Presbyters* should have; Prelacy rises upon the ruines of Presbyters; yet I suppose the generality of those who are for Episcopacy, will give the Doctor no thanks

thanks for that clause of the Definition; but it agrees very well with their new Prelates; for at their first appearance in the world, they stand in a posture of opposition against the *Presbyters* of the Church of *Scotland*; they libel them, they effectually depose them, if not excommunicate them; nor can they expect to be absolved, till they make these their Accusers their Judges, and stand in Judgment to be judged by them; and if we may guess by the Libel which the Judges themselves formed, the sentence would not be very comfortable.

There is yet another thing which would make them a very dangerous sort of Prelates, and that is, That they not only engross this Sovereign and Peerless power over *Presbyters*, but also (which other Prelates use not to do) they engross a singularity in Holiness, as if they, and they alone, had followed God, and were free of Defections, which other Ministers are involved in; and it's like, this is one of the Foundations of their new Sovereignty, that they think themselves, though the lesser, yet the sounder part of the ministry. It puts me in mind of a Countryman, who understood not Latine, who heard some talking great things that the *senior pars Ecclesiae* could do; he enquired what is he, that *Sanior*? he seems to be some great man? but except they be Judges themselves, they will not be accounted by men of sound minds, to be the sounder part of the Church; Nay, *Orestes* himself would say it, and swear it, That the contrivance of this Bond was not the work of a man sound in his mind.

Non

Non sani esse homines non sanus juret Orestes.

Any may see with half an eye, that this is not a Presbyterial form of Government; for in Presbytery, the Plurality carries matters, and the part is ruled by the whole; but here the part, and a very little considerable part, and a part not in conjunction with the whole, but that hath disjoyned it self from the whole, takes upon it to govern the whole, even as if a little Toe should disjoyn it self from the Body, and then take upon it to judge the whole Body, and dispose of it at its pleasure.

It is a wonder, that so few men, so inconsiderable for number and parts, were not ashamed to think of their sitting and judging so many Ministers; let be to publish it to the world. As their high Court of Justice would have made strange havock of Magistrates, and readily dispatched some Presbyterian Minister for Loyalty, as Mr. Love was dispatched in *England* to be a terrour to others; so this Ecclesiastick Judicatory in all appearance, if Ministers had been such fools as to have owned them, would have made great havock of Ministers; for a few weak men, not sound in their Principles, and transported with Passion and Impatience, and possessed with a Conceit of their singular Purity and Zeal, and usurping a pre-eminency over the generality of Ministers, and taking on them to be their Judges, and talking of no less than deposition, before they were in any capacity to depose, would have made a very Kittle-Court.

It's

It's a sad spectacle to behold many through ignorance and blinding humours, running into the same evils which they in words disclaim. They in words disclaim Independency, and yet really make the people and not Church-Officers to be Rulers and guides to direct Ministers what to preach and do, and to depose them if they obey not these directions. They who called themselves the Council of the Army which was broken at *Bethwel-Bridge*, were highly displeased with the indulged Ministers, because the secret Council had sent instructions to them, though the indulged Ministers did not accept of them; and yet these same persons took upon them to prescribe to those Ministers and Preachers that were with them, what Doctrine they should preach; which was an encroachment beyond any thing done by the secret Council. B

Some talk of Presbytery and Presbyterian parity, and of their detestation of Prelacy; and in the mean time, set up Prelacy; it's a great evidence of a Spirit of giddiness, when people run round, as those who run in a Circle, and so run to that point from which they once did run.

The Declaration at *Sanquair* is refuted in the Confutation of the Bonds; and the truth is, such principles and practices are so absurd and destructive to all Rule and Government, that they are not worthy of Refutation, and should be answered with detestation and abhorrence. They conclude that Declaration, hoping that none will blame them for, or offend at their reward.
ing

ing those that are against them, as they have done to them; if they had considered *Prov.* 20. 22. *Say not thou, I will recompence evil; but wait on the Lord, and he shall save thee;* and *Prov.* 24. 29. *Say not, I will do so to him, as he hath done to me: I will render to the man according to his work.* *Rom.* 12. 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 1 *Thes.* 5. 15. 1 *Pet.* 3. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. They might have seen how groundless and absurd this hope was. The 8 and 9 verses of the 137 *Psalms* are wrested, when applied to justify such unchristian Practices; for that Scripture is a prediction of the prosperous success that the *Medes* and *Persians* should have in destroying *Babylon*; which is also foretold, *Isa.* 45. 1, 3, 4, 13. and not a Rule to warrant us to revenge our selves, and to dash out the brains of Infants. It's among the delusions of the time, that some know not of what Spirit they are, and imagine that to be the Zeal of God, which is nothing but the wrath of man, which worketh not the Righteousness of God.

It is meet to shut up this sad Subject with humble and earnest Supplications, That the Lord would humble us in the sight and sense of our sins, which have procured the dreadful Judgments and Plagues which have come upon this sinful Generation; That he would convince us of our sins, and make every one sensible of the Plagues of his own heart, and of the Plagues that are upon the hearts of others, which are among the most dreadful evidences of the anger of God, that Magistrates, Ministers, people
of

of all ranks, may take with their sins, and take shame and confusion of face to themselves, because of their own sins, and the sins of others.

That he would so turn in mercy and loving-kindness, and turn us again, that our backslidings be not perpetual; and turn the hearts of Rulers and the hearts of people to himself; and the hearts of Rulers to the people, and the hearts of people to the Rulers; the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers; that Rulers may have the love, kindness, pity and compassion of fathers towards the people, and may not by rigor and severity provoke the children to wrath, and may pity those who are distempered by sad sufferings; and that the Lord would incline their hearts to take speedy course that the poor people who wander as sheep without shepherds, and who through their own ignorance, and humours, and distempers, are exposed as a prey to seducers, to Jesuits, and those who are influenced by them, who drive poor unstable people (who are destitute of faithful Teachers to discover to them the devices of Satan, and of his Instruments) into snares and mischievous practices, and makes them imagine that those paths of the destroyer are the way to an outgate from their calamities. That the Lord would incline, I say, their hearts to take speedy course that these poor wandering sheep may be provided with Pastors after the Lords heart, who may feed them with knowledge and understanding, with sound doctrine, with the wholesome words of Christ, that they may not
be

be turned from the truth unto fables, but by the words of the Lords mouth they may be kept out of the paths of the destroyer, and any who are intangled through the devices of Satan, and subtil deceivers, may be recovered in time out of these snares. And that the Lord would incline the hearts of people to be subject to principalities and powers, and to obey Magistrates, to fear God, and honour the King, and keep them that they be not tempted by grievous pressures to cast off the yoke of lawful Authority, but may possess their souls in patience; and wait on the Lord in the way of his judgments, who often makes use of lawful Magistrates to punish his people for their sins; and though the Magistrate may be wrong, yet God is righteous, and we should be humbled under his hand. It's a very humbling dispensation, when Parents and Magistrates are alienate from, and rigid against their children and subjects; and we should not be chafed and enraged, but humbled under the mighty hand of God; and carry with that lowliness and meekness, patience and respect to lawful Authority, that we may commend ourselves to the consciences of all in the sight of God, that being reviled, we may bless; being persecuted, we may suffer it; being defamed, we may entreat.

And seeing the Devil is so active to rent the Church, and to ruine it, and to render the Ministers of the Gospel, and so the Gospel it self, contemptible; we should, if we can do no more, pray for the peace of *Jerusalem*, and that the

Lord

Lord would let people see the devices of Satan and Seducers, who draw them away from under the eye of the Shepherd, that they may destroy them ; and that he would convince people, that it's their duty to esteem Ministers very highly in love for their works sake , and for their Masters sake ; for they who despise them, despise Christ, and the Father who sent Christ.

Farmer. Sir, I think my self much obliged to you for the pains you have taken for my information ; and I ingenuously acknowledg I am by what I have heard, instructed in many things of which I was ignorant. I shall desire, before we part, that ye would give me some directions how to order my way in this dark and dangerous time in which my lot hath fallen ; it's seldom that I have occasion to converse with Ministers, which makes me the more desirous to make the best use of their company I can, when any of them come this way.

Minist. There are many excellent directions in several of these Papers that I was speaking of before, it were your advantage to have them. I shall only give you a few.

1. Let that be your earnest study to be in Christ, and to walk in him ; to know him, and to be found in him, having his righteousness ; and to be conformed to him, to walk as he walked. The Apostle *Paul* counted all things loss for the excellency of the knowledg of Christ, and to be found in him, &c. and he travelled as in birth to have Christ formed in the *Galatians*. It's to this
fel.

be turned from the truth unto fables, but by the words of the Lords mouth they may be kept out of the paths of the destroyer, and any who are intangled through the devices of Satan, and subtil deceivers, may be recovered in time out of these snares. And that the Lord would incline the hearts of people to be subject to principalities and powers, and to obey Magistrates, to fear God, and honour the King, and keep them that they be not tempted by grievous pressures to cast off the yoke of lawful Authority, but may possess their souls in patience; and wait on the Lord in the way of his judgments, who often makes use of lawful Magistrates to punish his people for their sins; and though the Magistrate may be wrong, yet God is righteous, and we should be humbled under his hand. It's a very humbling dispensation, when Parents and Magistrates are alienate from, and rigid against their children and subjects; and we should not be chafed and enraged, but humbled under the mighty hand of God; and carry with that lowliness and meekness, patience and respect to lawful Authority, that we may commend our selves to the consciences of all in the sight of God, that being reviled, we may bless; being persecuted, we may suffer it; being defamed, we may entreat.

And seeing the Devil is so active to rent the Church, and to ruine it, and to render the Ministers of the Gospel, and so the Gospel it self, contemptible; we should, if we can do no more, pray for the peace of *Jerusalem*, and that the

Lord

Lord would let people see the devices of Satan and Seducers, who draw them away from under the eye of the Shepherd, that they may destroy them ; and that he would convince people, that it's their duty to esteem Ministers very highly in love for their works sake , and for their Masters sake ; for they who despise them, despise Christ, and the Father who sent Christ.

Farmer. Sir, I think my self much obliged to you for the pains you have taken for my information ; and I ingenuously acknowledg I am by what I have heard, instructed in many things of which I was ignorant. I shall desire, before we part, that ye would give me some directions how to order my way in this dark and dangerous time in which my lot hath fallen ; it's seldom that I have occasion to converse with Ministers, which makes me the more desirous to make the best use of their company I can, when any of them come this way.

Minist. There are many excellent directions in several of these Papers that I was speaking of before, it were your advantage to have them. I shall only give you a few.

1. Let that be your earnest study to be in Christ, and to walk in him ; to know him, and to be found in him, having his righteousness ; and to be conformed to him, to walk as he walked. The Apostle *Paul* counted all things loss for the excellency of the knowledg of Christ, and to be found in him, &c. and he travelled as in birth to have Christ formed in the *Galatians*. It's to this
fel-

fellowship with Christ that God calls us in the Gospel; and then give all diligence to make your calling and election sure. It's sad to see several people who will talk great things of the interests of Christ in the Land, so ignorant of Christ, and of union with him, and so unconcerned as to their own interest in Christ, that though they have no assurance of it, and cannot give one mark of interest in Christ; yet they are not sensible of this, nor regretting it, nor earnestly seeking in publick or private to know him, to be in him, to know if they be in him, but they are taken up with other things. Christ is not in their mind, heart, and mouth; they are not speering after him in their private converse, as the Spouse doth in the Song: *Saw ye him whom my soul loveth?* They are more in seeking to know some useles barren notion, some jangling debate, than they are in seeking to know Christ and him crucified; more taken up in apprehending some unedifying empty conceit, than in apprehending Christ, or seeking to be apprehended by him. Who can think that they are truly careful about Christs interests in the Land, who are careless about their own interest in Christ, and give no diligence to make sure their calling. If folk were taken up about the one thing necessary, it would take them off their vain janglings about these things, which tend neither to edification nor peace. They who are striving to enter in at the strait gate, and taking the kingdom of heaven by violence, and working out the work of their salvation with fear and trembling, and giving

ving diligence to make their calling and election sure, will not find leisure to dote about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, and evil surmisings. That weighty question, *What shall I do to be saved?* would take folk off from unedifying questions, and doubtful disputations.

2. Be much in the exercise of Faith and Repentance; ye must live and walk by Faith, and be daily searching out your sins, looking into the sink of original corruption, that loathsome, stinking, corrupt body of Death, that is ever present with you, to hinder you from good, and incline you to evil; and to the innumerable swarms of actual sins, which compass you about; and ye must be daily confessing your sins, judging your self, lamenting after the Lord, lying at the Fountain opened to the house of *David*, and Inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, and coming through the great High Priest Jesus the Son of God, to the Throne of Grace, to obtain Mercy and find Grace to help in the time of need. These exercises would hold you doing, and keep you from meddling, as a busie-body, in things too high for you, and that do not belong to you; and are not within the compass of your calling: if ye were thus exercised, ye would walk humbly with God, and humbly with men; ye would be so far from bidding others stand by themselves, as if ye were holier than they, that in holiness of mind ye would esteem others better than your selves; and so far from casting at fellowship with the Lords people in publick

Ordinances or private worship ; that ye would rather judge your self unworthy of their fellowship ; and if ye could do it, would rather separate from your self than from others, ye would think it a great mercy and priviledge, that the like of you had any access to wait at the posts of the Lords doors, and any place in his Courts ; beware of those who undervalue the preaching of Faith and Repentance, for this was the Doctrine of the Prophets, of *John* the Baptist, who came preaching the Doctrine of Repentance, and directing his hearers to the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the World. Christ himself preached, that men should repent and believe the Gospel ; and the Apostle *Paul* taught Repentance toward God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.

Repentance and Faith are as necessary for the beginning and progress of our motion towards Heaven, as our two legs are necessary for walking ; and the exercise of Faith and Repentance cease not, till all tears be wiped away, and Faith be turned into sight ; to cut off the exercise of Faith and Repentance, is to cut off the legs of a man, who is fleeing from sin and wrath to the true City of Refuge. Ye may be sure, that those Teachers who make it their business to discover to you your sins and diseases, your poverty, nakedness, filthiness, and direct you to Christ, as the Saviour of sinners, as the Physitian of souls, as full of grace and truth, who hath fine white Raiment, fine Gold, who is a fountain opened, who teach you to
loath

loath your selves, and to love Christ ; to have no confidence in the flesh , but to rejoyce in the Lord Jesus ; who teach you , that you are nothing, and he is all ; that you may not glory in your selves, but in the Lord ; you may be assured that they preach the same that Christ and his Apostles preached ; and if you were rightly sensible of your own sins, and humbled for them ; then the consideration of the sins of others, would not puff you up, but humble you further, *Dan. 9. 5, 6, 7, 8.* Beware of the way of those who talk of the sins of others, as if they were accusers, leading a process against others, and commending themselves by condemning others ; for that looks like the strain of the *Pharisee* in the 18. of *Luke* The sins of our Rulers, Ministers, and of persons of all ranks should make us ashamed, *Ezr. 9. 6.*

3. Let the Glory of God, and the enjoying of God, be your chief end, and take his word, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, for the only Rule to direct you how to glorifie and enjoy him ; deny your self, beware of self-seeking, self-pleasing, of pleasing your own humors or the humors of others. Let that be your great design to please God, to be accepted of him ; if you can please others to their edification , become all things to all for gaining of them ; but beware ye displease not God, to please any ; make no mans Testimony , though it were given immediately before his death , the rule of your Faith or Practice ; so long as men are here on earth, they

know but in part, and even good men may err in their judgment and practice in several things ; some are so easily misled, that if a Paper come to their hand, that pleases them in some opinion that they are addicted to, they take all the rest of it for unquestionable truth without examination ; or if a Preacher be of their party, they implicitly follow him in any thing he says or does : beware of listning to Impulses and Revelations, which ye find born in upon you, even though ye be in a good frame of Spirit when they are cast in ; for Satan can turn himself into an Angel of light, and wait such occasions of suggesting errors ; and he can delude people by suggesting, that such or such a Scripture, makes for his deluding suggestions. *Peter* roved even when he was in the Mount, beholding Christs Transfiguration, when he moved, that Christ might abide in the Mount ; and after he had given that excellent Confession of Christ, That he was the Son of God, which not flesh and blood, but the Father had revealed to him ; Satan suggests to him, to dissuade Christ from going to *jerusalem* to suffer, which drew that sharp rebuke from the blessed mouth of Christ, *Get thee behind me Satan.*

The Devil can back his suggestions with Scriptures, which he perverts, as we see he did, when he tempted Christ to cast himself down from the Pinacle of the Temple ; and therefore there is the more need to search the Scripture, and to compare Scripture with Scripture, and to con-

consider what goeth before, and what followeth in the Scripture; and to know the Analogy of Faith from the Scriptures that are more clear; and as it is holden forth from the Scriptures in the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, that ye may not receive any sense of Scripture which is contrary to the Analogy of Faith, to the Doctrine which is according to godliness received in the Reformed Churches. Beware of adding to the word of God, by making these things Duties, which God hath not commanded; or making any thing sinful, which God hath not forbidden; there are too many who will confidently impose their Conceits upon others, and too many who are easily imposed upon; simple people who believe every word, and are tossed to and fro with every wind. Study to be well founded in the Scriptures, that with the *Bereans* ye may try Doctrines and Practices by the Rule of the holy Scripture. It's lamentable, that there is so great ignorance of the Scriptures; and many are more in reading other writings than in reading the holy Scriptures. Walk exactly according to the light which the Lord hath given to you from his word, detain it not in unrighteousness, and beware ye go no further than the light of the word directs you; for if ye go out of the light, and be in the dark, ye know not how far ye may wander; they who without direction from the word, do blindly follow the example of others, and know not whether it be right or wrong, or take what others do to be right, because such or such persons

sons does it, they are in an ill taking. Beware ye go not without the word, walk in the Law of the Lord, in the light of the word, which is a light to the feet, and a Lamp to the paths.

4. And that ye may be nourished up in the knowledge of the Scriptures of truth; go to the publick Ordinances, forsake not assembling together with the Lords people, who meet in his name; the Lord hath commanded his Ministers to teach and baptize, &c. and hath promised to be with them to the end of the world, and hath promised, That where he records his Name, there he will come and bless his people; he hath appointed Ministers for this end, to feed his people with the knowledge and understanding of the word, with the sincere Milk of the word; and therefore if ye would glorifie the Name of the Lord, if ye would have fellowship with God, if you would have his presence and his Blessing, if ye would know his mind and will revealed in his word, frequent his Ordinances, beware of those who would draw you away from the Shepherds Tents, for they draw you away from Christ himself; for it's there that he feeds and makes his Flocks to rest. Believe not those who say, That he is not to be found in his own Ordinances; for there he is, and hath trysted his people to meet him there; and he hath promised to come there and bless them, whenever they are met in his name. He is present, he is not to come, when they are met in his Name; for he is come already; *There am I,* saith he, *in the midst of them.* The sins of those
who

who are present at the Lords Ordinances shall not deprive those who, upon his call, comes to record his Name of his Presence and blessing; for he is faithful who hath promised; and they who come according to his appointment, to glorifie his Name in his own Ordinances, may be assured, that he comes and blesses them, though it may be, they do not sensibly discern it; and they are bound to believe it, that he hath come and blessed them, because he hath said it.

Beware of those who think they are the best and most tender Christians, who are readiest to cast Ministers as no Ministers, and Churches as no Churches; there were many great faults in the Church of *Corinth*, in several of the Churches of *Asia*, and their Angels; and yet Christ himself owns them and their Angels, as Churches, and Angels; and we find not that the Lord directs any to separate from these Churches, or their Assemblies for publick worship, because of those scandalous sins, which were among them. We find, Christ himself present in the Church of *Laodicea*, which was the worst of them, and standing at their door and knocking. It's insolent boldness to cast these as no Churches and Ministers, whom Christ owns; or who condemn going to these Meetings where Christ himself comes and blesses his people; remember that your great business in Ordinances, is with the Lord himself; for they are his Ordinances he hath appointed them; the efficacy of them, depends upon his Institution and Blessing, and not upon

the worthiness and intention of Ministers; whoever absent themselves, ye may be sure he is present whom your soul should seek; come, because he calls you, and because he comes and blesses his people, where he causes his Name to be recorded. Learn to hear the Word, not as the word of man, but as the word of God. Esteem the Ministers of Christ very highly in love for their works-sake, and for their Masters sake. Beware of the way of those who cast at the Ordinances if they be not dispensed by Ministers of the most eminent gifts, or by Ministers who are in all things of their opinion; receive the Lords message of the hand of any of his Messengers. Beware of idolizing any Minister; Remember that neither he that planteth, nor he that watereth, is any thing, but God who giveth the encrease; And beware of undervaluing any of the Lords Ministers, seeing they are the Ministers of Christ, 1 Cor. 4. 1. In which Chapter the Apostle dissuades the *Corinthians* who overvalued some, and undervalued others of their Ministers, from this comparing and rash judging of Ministers; and among other Arguments uses this, *That they judge before the time*; he desires them to let alone that judging till the Lord come, ver. 5. who knew the counsels of the heart, and the hidden things of darkness.

Neglect not the private exercises of Religion upon the Lords day, but beware of the way of those who neglect the publick Ordinances; though they have the opportunity of them; these private Meetings which were kept in En-
gland

gland in a separating way from the solemn Assembly, became the Seminaries of error and heresie; when the sheep leave the shepherds tents, and the green Pastures of the Lords own Ordinances, what wonder if they wander, and grow sick, and dote about questions.

5. In your private converse seek for the things which make for peace, and for mutual edification; beware ye waste not your time in vain janglings, and unedifying debates which distemper the minds and hearts of those who dote upon them, and diverts them from edifying purposes. When ye meet with those who are given to these janglings, if ye can by Scripture and reason reclaim them from that snare, essay it with meekness of wisdom. If ye find them impatient to be contradicted, and not capable through passion and prejudice to receive instruction, then fall upon some good edifying purposes, wherein you and they agree, that whereunto ye have attained, ye may walk according to the same rule. If you find that they will neither hold off their janglings, (and that's very ordinary for a spirit of error or schism, to hold people perpetually upon those things which foster error or division) nor yet receive instruction; your converse with such is not like to be fruitful; imploy others to deal with them, and be much in praying for them, and be ready to do them any good that they will admit or accept of.

Beware of wasting your time in speaking ill of absent persons; remember the words, *Tit. 3. To speak evil of no man, &c.* Make not that your design

esig n to wrong the same of any person, as the
 word imports ; hate the way of such whose
 work it is to render Ministers and those who dis-
 fer from them, in any thing hateful, and to put
 them out of capacity as far as in them lyes to
 serve the Lord in their generation and station.
 Beware of rash determinations of questions
 which ye understand not ; some people are so
 rash, that no question is started but they will
 presently determine it ; and having vented their
 judgment, they will not readily retract. Meddle
 not as a busie-body in other mens matters, and
 in things too high for you, which are not with-
 in the compass of your calling. Waste not your
 precious time, as many people do, in State-in-
 trigues ; It belongs to the Representatives of
 Nations, and not to private persons, to deter-
 mine matters of that nature. What the Repre-
 sentatives of Nations may do for righting what
 is wrong in the Government of Nations, is a
 question which the Representatives of Nations,
 and not private persons should move and resolve.
 It's a trick of Satan and seditious Jesuits to di-
 vert people from the duties of their Christian
 and particular callings, and to break and crack
 their brains in over-stretching them to reach
 things that are above them, and to grasp mat-
 ters which they can never comprehend ; and
 though they could understand them, have no
 call to meddle with them. And if private
 persons take the sword which God hath not gi-
 ven to them, to right what they think wrong, by
 strong hand ; And if private persons take upon
 them to depose Ministers for real or apprehend-
 ed

ed faults, this is the high-way to all confusion, to turn State and Church upside down, and to fill the world with murthers and butcheries, to turn it into a Butcher-house, and to fill the Church with schism, and damnable errors. These are the methods of the lying and murdering spirit, to make havock of the souls and bodies of men.

6. Imitate the example of our Lord Jesus, *Ephes. 5. 1. Be followers of God as dear children, and walk in love as Christ also hath loved us. Let all bitterness and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christs sake hath forgiven you. Put on therefore as the Elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another. If any man have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness. Love them that hate you. Bless and curse not. Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good. Learn of Christ to be meek and lowly in heart, shew all meekness to all men. The ornament of a meek and quiet spirit is of great price in the sight of God. When ye are injured and persecuted, learn of Christ to be patient, and in your patience possess your souls. Look above men who wrong you, unto God, who is correcting or trying you, and be humbled, and patient under the mighty hand of God, fret not at the prosperity of those who for a while bring*

bring evil devices to pass, but trust in the Lord, and be doing good. And delight thy self in the Lord: Commit your way to him: Wait on the Lord, and in well-doing commit your self to him as to a faithful Creator. Take heed to your spirit, beware that ye be not deluded by Satan, and brought to imagine, that wrathful revenge is zeal. *Who is a wise man, and endued with knowledg among you? let him shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom; but if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and be not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish; for where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easie to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisie. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.* The Spirit of Christ opposeth that spirit which lusterh to envy and revenge. When *James* and *John* would have been at fire from Heaven to consume the *Samaritans*, Christ turned and rebuked them, and said, *Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of man is not come to destroy mens lives, but to save them.* Let that be your constant design and endeavour to expresse the praises, the vertues of Christ in resembling him in loveliness, in love, in bowels and mercies, in humility, lowliness of heart, in self-denial, in gentleness, meekness, patience, long-suffering, forbearance, forgiveness; that the same mind may be in you that was in Christ Jesus; that ye
may

may be in the world as he was in the world ; that ye may walk in his steps ; that ye may be conformed to the Image of the Son of God, and Christ formed in you. He countenanced the Ordinances, he heard *John*, was baptized of him, when the people were baptized ; he was Circumcised, he Prayed, Preached, and eated the Passover , when *Judas* the Traytor was present ; he directed the Lepers whom he cured to shew themselves to the Priest ; he was subject to *Ioseph* and his Mother ; he payed tribute to *Cæsar*, and directed others to do so.

It adorns the Doctrine of God, when those who profess it, are dutiful in their several places and Stations ; when they join Righteousness with Religion, when they fear God and honour the King, when they are subject to Magistrates out of a principle of Conscience, when they are obedient Children, faithful servants, doing their work heartily, as to the Lord. And when it is other ways, the name of God is blasphemed, and the way of God is evil spoken of.

7. Beware of the first beginnings of sinful courses, beware lest any root of bitterness spring up ; if ye give way to the first motions of evil, they will encrease to more ungodliness ; if the desire after the sincere milk of the word begin to languish, if ye look not to it in time, ye may come to an indifferency, whether you hear the word or not, and that may increase to a loathing and lightlying of the word, and that may increase to a contempt of the Preaching of the word, and then God in his righteous judgment may leave you to be plagued with Papers and Pam-

Pamphlets, and Teachers after your own lusts, which will foster you in the contempt of the Ordinances ; and make you imagine, that it's tenderneſs and zeal, and a testimony, to deſpiſe the Lords Ordinances ; and ſo far delude you as to make you imagine that profanitie is Religion. If you let that honour and reſpect which by the command of God is due to Magiſtrates decay, you may come next to deſpiſe them, and curſe them in your heart and thought, and then mutter out theſe revilings in private, and then vent them openly, and from virulent words come to open violence, to deſign and endeavour to turn them out of their places, and murder them, and then be plagued with Papers and Doctrines, deluding you to that height as to bring you to think that this fury is the zeal of God. If ye loſe the eſteem, and love that ye ſhould have to the Miniſters of Chriſt, ye may come by degrees to deſpiſe them, and revile them, and to think it good ſervice to God to make their Miniſtry uſeleſs and contemptible ; yea, ye may come to that, to think it good ſervice to God to kill his ſervants ; and in the righteous judgment of God, you may be left to the deluſions of Satan, to imagine that theſe abominations make you holier than others ; tremble at the deceitfulneſs of the deſperately wicked heart of man, and at the dreadful but holy judgments of God, who gives over the backslider in heart to be filled with his own ways, and plagues thoſe who receive not the truth in love ; and who harbours and entertains luſts contrary to the word of God with ſtrong deluſions, and
with

with deluding Teachers, who tickle the itching ears of those who after their lusts heap up Teachers to themselves, with Doctrines which are suitable to their lusts.

8. That you may see the mischief of error and schism, and be guarded against it, Read Mr. *Durham's* excellent Treatise of *Scandal*, and the Preface prefixed by Mr. *Robert Blair*, that eminent Servant of the Lord, in whom holiness, learning, wisdom, prudence, zeal, experience, Ministerial authority, and gravity, were temperate in an eminent degree ; in the end of that Preface he saith, *I shall not detain much longer the Reader from the Treatise it self, having added these few considerations for heart-uniting in the Lord, which of all other, I conceive, ought to be most weighty in the judgment, and on the affections of all the lovers of our Lord Jesus Christ.* 1. From Eph. 2. 14, 15, 16, 17. the great peace-maker in offering up himself in a sacrifice for the sins of the Elect, intended with the reconciling of them to God, to unite them in one body among themselves ; yea even those who were at furthest distance, and greatest enmity, Jew and Gentile, and consequently other his Elect, in their several differences and divisions throughout their generations. He took on him the debt of their sins and enmities, and lifted up with himself these on his Cross, representatively, virtually, and meritoriously to expiate them in his flesh, and by his Spirit efficiently to slay and abolish them in due time by making them one new man in himself. Mark, I pray, from that Scripture cited, that this complex business is the great design of our blessed and great peace-maker. Also, 2ly, in the Sacrifice-feast
of

of his Supper, this is still represented and exhibited, till he come again. So that this standing Ordinance destinated and appointed of God, to carry on and seal up uniting with God, and one with another till he come again; at his coming will stand up and testify against all who comply not with Christ, but following their own inclination, act rather against his design. And, 3ly, in his solemn prayer, Joh. 17. which is a Specimen of his future Intercession, he mainly presseth after the Salvation and Sanctification of those that are given him, v. 21. That they also may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. Do not these words significantly and shiningly held out what the Mediator is still about, and that uniting in God is his design still? And, 4ly, upon the same very ground the great Apostle speaking to Jews and Gentiles, who had embraced the Gospel, and in them to all dissentients who love the Gospel-truths and Ordinances, saith, Rom. 15. 7. Wherefore receive ye one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God. Meritoriously and virtually, the Elect are received to the glory of God. And to the end they may be actually received, Receive one another, saith the Apostle; as it were suspending the one upon the other. And now upon these grounds Christ our Lord, his grand design being so conspicuous, his Supper-Ordinance standing as a land-mark in the way, having this engraven upon it, Union, Communion, the Glorious Mediator, his Intercession, running in the same channel, and the blessed Apostle making this the upshot of his Doctrine, what lover of our Lord, well advised and recollecting him-

himself, dare stiffly stand out from complying with him to satisfy their own inclination, and habituated custom and carriage. My fear is, that every one of us will look to some others, rather than themselves, as obstructing the desired uniting in the Lord. But upon mature after-thoughts, it will be found the mind of Christ, that we narrowly search our selves, every one of us, how we have provoked the Holy One to smite us so in his displeasure, and accurately to try what yet remains in us obstrusive to this union; and withal to flee to our slighted duty, as in a city they run to the quenching of a publick burning, laying this evil to heart more than Sword or Pestilence. All the writings and actings against Presbyterian Government, which is the wall of the house of God, have never wronged or hurt it so much as our ill-raised and worse continued contests. Our nakedness-discovering writings, what have they done but added oyl to the flames? For Christs sake, my reverend and dear Brethren, hearken to this word in season from the Oracles of God, and treasures of pure antiquity, pointing out the way of a godly and edifying peace. It will be no grief of heart, but sweet peace and consolation, when we are to appear before the Judge of the quick and the dead. Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus. So heartily prayeth your Brother and fellow-servant,

ROBERT BLAIR.

Thus far Reverend Mr. Blair, who was both a Son of Thunder and a Son of Peace, a Peace-maker. O with what authority and seriousness did I hear him press unity, in Preaching before a Synod from these words, *Phil. 2. 1. If there be there-*

T t

for

fore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the spirit, if any bowels & mercies, fulfil ye my joy that ye be like minded; having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind. And I heard him say upon Preaching before a general Assembly, That he could be content to be carried from the place in which he was Preaching, to his grave, to have the rent that then was in the Church cured. Ignorant and rash youths, who have not experience, and consider not what an abominable sin Schism is, and what are the mischievous consequences of it, and how it ordinarily ends in the ruin & desolation of a Church, they know little what they are doing, when they are blowing up the fire of contention; and it's a sport to some to cast such fire-brands. But they who have Heavenly wisdom, see that that sporting is mischievous madness, & that it will be bitter in the latter end. It is not for nought that the Spirit of God directed the Apost. Paul in writing to the Church of the *Corinthians*, in which there were many things wrong, to fall first upon the ill of divisions, *1 Cor. 1. 10.* and when he is shutting up that Epistle, he exhorts, that *all these things be done with charity, and to greet one another with an holy kiss.* And when he is shutting up the *2 Epist.* he concludes, *Finally, Brethren, farewell, be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you. Greet one another with an holy kiss.* So thus he begins and ends with this unity and peace.

9. And because no speaking nor reasoning will prevail against the working of a spirit of error and schism, without the effectual working of the Spirit

pirit of the Lord, let us humbly and earnestly pray, that the Lord would have mercy upon us, & for his Sons sake who came to destroy the works of the Devil, pour upon us the spirit of grace and of supplications, the spirit of faith & repentance, that we may look on him whom we have pierced, & mourn; the spirit of a sound mind, the spirit of love & peace. And that every one, Magistrates, Ministers and people, may be made sensible of their own sins. We should pray that the Lord would send his Spirit, that convinces the world of sin, to let us see our sins, and to let us see them written in our judgments, that we may accept of the punishment of our sins, & justify the Lord when he judges. The Lord often writes the sins of men in so great and legible letters in their judgments, that they who run may read them. *David* despised the Lord, and occasioned the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, by his adultery and murder; incestuous filthiness breaks out in his house, the sword departs not from his house, his people despise him, and follow *Absalom*. *Shimei*, an exasperate *Benjamite*, is let loose upon him, to revile and curse him, and cast stones at him; he disowns him as no King, gives him no title of honour, but only calls him a man, and which was worse, a bloody man, a man of *Belial*: and does not cry, and then flee; but goes along in the sight and hearing of the King, Courtiers, and Soldiers, cursing & casting stones and dust. *David* sees, that tho' *Shimei* did this contrary to the Law of God, which says, *Thou shalt not revile the Gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people*; Yet that he did it not without the over-ruling Providence of God; he saw that the Lord had let *Shimei* loose upon him, & is humbled under the hand of God. *Uzziah* will needs go to the

Temple, & exercise the Priests Office, & the Lord by Leprosie cuts him off from the House of the Lord, and from the exercise of his Kingly Office. When the Priests did not impartially apply the Law of God to reclaim the people from their sins, no doubt they thought thus to keep in with the people; but this brought them to be base & contemptible before all the people, *Mal. 2. 9.* The *Jews* that remained in the land, after the ruin of the Temple, though they had but one Prophet, yet they despise him, they will not hear the word which *Jeremiah* spoke in the name of the Lord, but they would do what went out of their own mouth; and therefore the Lord leaves them to live like Pagans, & swears by his great name, that his name should not be named any more in their mouths; they should not have so much as the form & profession of the worship of the true God, *Jer. 44. 16, 26.* they would not be reprov'd by *Ezek. ch. 3. 26.* & they are plagued with the want of a reprov'r. When people will reject the counsel of the Lord, & will not hearken to his voice, nor take his gracious offer made in the Gospel; when they will not endure sound Doctrine, nor desire the sincere milk of the word, nor receive the truth in love, the Lord justly gives them up to their own hearts lusts, to walk in their own counsels, to strong delusions, to believe lyes, to be tossed to and fro with every wind of Doctrine, to turn aside to fables. When they despise his servants, & will not receive his messengers, & their message, & count them enemies for telling the truth, the Lord removes his servants from them, & leaves them to be deluded with teachers, which are after their own humours and lusts. When people refuse to hear the Lords words, and walk after the imaginations of their
own

own heart, *Jer. 13. 10.* the Lord fills them with drunkenness, that they destroy one another like drunken men, who know not what they are doing, *v. 13.* *Behold, I will fill all the Inhabitants of this Land, even the Kings that sit upon Davids Throne, and the Priests, and the Prophets, and all the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, with drunkenness. And I will dash them one against another, even the Fathers and the Sons together, saith the Lord: I will not pity, nor spare, nor have mercy, but destroy them. Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud, for the Lord hath spoken. Give glory to the Lord your God before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the dark mountains, and while ye look for light, he turn it into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness.*

When folk will follow their own imaginations, and will not walk in the light of the word of God, the Lord fills them with drunkenness, and leaves them to dash upon one another, and destroy one another like drunken men fighting in the dark. But neither words nor rods will be rightly understood or laid to heart, till the Spirit be poured from on high. If the Lord would pour out his Spirit, we would not only be brought to see our sins, but to be ashamed of them, to take shame and confusion of face to our selves; we would sorrow and mourn, and lament after the Lord; we would turn from our sins to the Lord, and joyn our selves to the Lord, and we would joyn together in seeking the Lord in his Ordinances; then the Wilderness would be a fruitful field, the dead and scattered bones would be joyned together and live; then *Judah* and *Israel* would be one stick in the hand of the Lord, *Ezek. 37.* Then *the Children of Israel and Judah would come together, going, and weeping, seeking the Lord their God, asking*

the

the way to Sion with their faces thitherward, saying, Come and let us joyn our selves unto the Lord in a perpetual Covenant that shall not be forgotten, *Jer.* 50. 4, 5. When the Spirit is poured out from on high upon his people, then the Lord turns to them a pure Language, that they may call upon the Name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent ; then they turn humble Suplicants , and pour out their hearts in groans and sighs that cannot be uttered ; then Pride and Haughtiness is taken away, and people become poor in Spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh, but trust in the Lord, and rejoyce in the Lord Jesus, *Zeph.* 3. 9, 10, 11, 12. *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. *Phil.* 3. 3. Till the Lord come, till he return with mercy and loving-kindness, and turn us again, and cause his face to shine, and see our ways, and heal us, we will but wax worse and worse ; there is no remedy for us, but in his Sovereign Gracc, and those mercies that have been of old, and endure for ever. Let us look to him who is exalted to give Repentance to *Israel*, and Remission of sins ; that he would turn us, that we may be turned, and heal our backslidings, and heal our breaches, that he may utter that quickning word, *Ezek.* 37. 9. Come from the four winds, O breath, and breath upon these slain, that they may live ; O Lord come, and overcome our evil with thy goodness ; for who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the Remnant of thy heritage, and retains not anger for ever ; because thou delights in mercy, who will turn again, and will have compassion upon us ; he will subdue our iniquities, and thou wilt cast all their sins in the depth of the Sea ; thou wilt perform the truth to *Jacob*, and the mercy to *Abraham*, which thou hast sworn to our Fathers

thers from the days of old, *Micha* 7. 18, 19, 20. We have not remembred our Covenant, but have spoken words falsly, in making a Covenant. Nevertheless, O Lord, remember thy Covenant, and establish to us an everlasting Covenant, that we may remember our ways, and be ashamed. Establish thy Covenant with us, that we may know that thou art the Lord, that we may remember and be confounded, and never open our mouth any more, because of our shame, when thou art pacified toward us for all that we have done. O Lord, Righteousness belongs to thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as it is this day to all of us ; to our Kings, Princes, Fathers, Ministers, people of all ranks, belongs Confusion ; but to the Lord our God belongs mercies and forgiveness, tho' we have sinned against him. Lord, give us Repentance, and turn us, and we shall be turned. Let thy power be great, according as thou hast spoken, saying, *The Lord is long-suffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression.* Lord, humble our uncircumcised hearts, that we may take with our sins, and accept of the punishment of them, that we may remember them with shame and sorrow ; but do not thou remember against us former iniquities, but according to thy mercy remember us, for thy goodness sake. O Lord, remember for us thy Covenant, and repent according to the multitude of thy mercies, and for thy names-sake pardon our iniquities, for they are many and great. And when Wisdom, and Council, and Strength, when Light and Life is gone, and when Unity is gone, when there is none to help, and none of the Sons of *Zion* to take her by the hand in her distress, when there is none to make up the breach, no Intercessor, let thine own arm bring salvation.

When

When all earthly Glory is stained, blasted and gone;
 appear in thine own Glory, in the glory of thy wisdom,
 power, and Sovereign grace, in building *Sion*,
 build the house, and bear the glory; that when thou
 hast done the work by thy Spirit, grace, grace may
 be glorified, and that this may be written for the Generations
 to come, that the people which shall be created, may praise the
 Lord. We do not present our Supplications before thee for our
 righteousness, for we are all as an unclean thing, and our
 righteousness as filthy rags; but for thy great mercy, O Lord,
 hear, O Lord forgive, O Lord hearken, and do; defer not
 for thy own sake, O our God! for this people are called by thy
 Name. O Lord, the hope of *Israel*, the Savior thereof in the
 time of trouble, though our iniquities testify against us, do for
 thy name sake, if thou mark our iniquity, we cannot stand,
 but there is forgiveness with thee, that thou may be feared;
 there is mercy with thee, and plenteous redemption; and thou
 redeemest *Israel* from all his iniquities and troubles. O remember
 not against us former iniquities; let thy tender mercies
 speedily prevent us, for we are brought very low; help us,
 O God of our Salvation, for the Glory of thy name; and
 deliver, and purge away our sins for thy name sake; save
 this people, bless thy Inheritance, feed them also, and lift
 them up for ever. Save us, O Lord our God, and gather us
 to give thanks unto thy holy name, and to triumph in thy
 praise. Blessed be the Lord God of *Israel* from everlasting to
 everlasting; and let all the people say *Amen*. Praise ye the
 Lord. Unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only
 wise God, be Honour and Glory for ever and ever. *Amen*.

o
e
e
s
h
n
y
l,
ar